

20010615.qrp v02_n221.qrl.20010615

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 19:03:10 EDT

From: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: QRP-L digest 2221

QRP-L Digest 2221

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) [100126] Re: [100041] Operating in VE land
by Doug Faunt N6TQS +1-510-655-8604 <faunt@panix.com>
- 2) [100127] Re: Field Day idea / portable suitcase
by <brownh@hartford-hwp.com>
- 3) [100128] OT: A Real, Bloody War and Capacitors
by jacksonharbor@att.net
- 4) [100129] FW: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
by Tayloe Dan-P26412 <Dan.Tayloe@motorola.com>
- 5) [100130] RE: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
by Tayloe Dan-P26412 <Dan.Tayloe@motorola.com>
- 6) [100131] RE: [100041] Operating in VE land
by "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
- 7) [100132] Inductance problem
by "Stephen D. Markowitz" <sdmarko@attglobal.net>
- 8) [100133] RE: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
by RLemmel@aol.com
- 9) [100134] Re: Inductance problem
by "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
- 10) [100135] Re: qsl cards - authentication
by Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
- 11) [100136] RE: [100022] qsl cards
by Brian Kassel <bkassel@dancris.com>
- 12) [100137] QRO op surprised by my QRP SSB signals
by "Donny Sirait" <dsirait@centrin.net.id>
- 13) [100138] FS: TechAmerica Soldering Station
by John Wagner <john@neknetwork.com>
- 14) [100139] Re: Regarding my QSL question
by Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
- 15) [100140] Re: qsl cards
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
- 16) [100141] Re: Balun - How to test?
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
- 17) [100142] Reforming electrolytics
by "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
- 18) [100143] Re: qsl cards
by Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
- 19) [100144] [CONTEST] QRP Contest Calendar June 16-25

- by Ken Newman <N2CQ@citnet.com>
- 20) [100145] FOX: Official Notice
by "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
- 21) [100146] Re: QRO op surprised by my QRP SSB signals
by "Scott Rosenfeld [N7JI]" <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>
- 22) [100147] Re: Balun - How to test?
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
- 23) [100148] Re: Wars and Capacitors
by W2SH@aol.com
- 24) [100149] Re: qsl cards
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
- 25) [100150] [MH101] SW30+ RCVR specs from K8IQY
by "Chuck Adams, K7Q0" <k7qo@earthlink.net>
- 26) [100151] [MH201] Announcement for September
by "Chuck Adams, K7Q0" <k7qo@earthlink.net>
- 27) [100152] Re: FOX - Pesky Texan Fox Hunt
by "Jay Bromley" <w5jay@alltel.net>
- 28) [100153] Indiannapolis?
by Michael Bower <bowerm@ix.netcom.com>
- 29) [100154] CLUB: WestFLA QRP Meeting this Saturday, 16 June 2001
by "Stephen D. Cohen" <scohen@tampabay.rr.com>
- 30) [100155] Re: Balun - How to test?
by "Ingo DK3RED" <dk3red@t-online.de>
- 31) [100156] Summer FOX Hunt
by "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
- 32) [100157] Re: qsl cards
by "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>
- 33) [100158] Re: Balun - How to test?
by "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
- 34) [100159] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 35) [100160] Re: multiband dipole ant
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 36) [100161] Re: Poor Dipole SWR
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 37) [100162] Re: G5RV Balun Use Question
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 38) [100163] Re: Suppression of Even Harmonics
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 39) [100164] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 40) [100165] Re: qsl cards - authentication
by Curt Milton <wb8yyy@yahoo.com>
- 41) [100166] Re: SSB rigs for camping & demos
by "ss lyon" <sslyon@megalink.net>
- 42) [100167] Congratulations on your homebrew 40m xceiver!
by "AI2Q Alex" <ai2q@adelphia.net>
- 43) [100168] Kenwood HF accessory items FS

- by "Ken Simpson, W8EK" <W8EK@fdt.net>
- 44) [100169] BNC to from binding post
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 45) [100170] RE: Reforming electrolytics
by "AI2Q Alex" <ai2q@adelphia.net>
- 46) [100171] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
by "Mark J. Dulcey" <mark@buttery.org>
- 47) [100172] SMK & TOROID KIT SHIPPING
by WA6GER@aol.com
- 48) [100173] [OP] Alternative Power Event
by Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
- 49) [100174] Re: BNC to from binding post
by Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
- 50) [100175] Re: Reforming electrolytics
by "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>
- 51) [100176] Re: qsl cards
by Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
- 52) [100177] Bleeding edge 20M FD filter
by "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
- 53) [100178] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Garie Halstead <k8kfj@ntelos.net>
- 54) [100179] RE: [Elecrafft] QRP Operation Tips?
by "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
- 55) [100180] RE: BNC to from binding post
by "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
- 56) [100181] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
by "Brian" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
- 57) [100182] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "Brian" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
- 58) [100183] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
- 59) [100184] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "N7SG K7FD" <k7fd@hotmail.com>
- 60) [100185] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
by "Mark J. Dulcey" <mark@buttery.org>
- 61) [100186] Re: Homebrew 40m xceiver finished
by "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
- 62) [100187] Pleasant Surprises
by "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
- 63) [100188] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Frank Brickley <brickley@pobox.com>
- 64) [100189] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
- 65) [100190] FS K2
by n2go@arrl.net
- 66) [100191] RE: SMK & TOROID KIT SHIPPING
by "Paul Warman" <pswarman@pswarman.screaming.net>
- 67) [100192] R.E. MC1350P

- by Stan Yarema <bg783@scn.org>
- 68) [100193] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "Bill Jones" <kd7s@psnw.com>
- 69) [100194] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "Dan Evans" <n9rla@yahoo.com>
- 70) [100195] Re: Suppression of Even Harmonics
by "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
- 71) [100196] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 72) [100197] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 73) [100198]
by Cameron Bailey <kt3a@juno.com>
- 74) [100199] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
- 75) [100200] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
- 76) [100201] card from Abubaker , 5A1A
by "George Osier" <gosier@twcnny.rr.com>
- 77) [100202] Al caps
by "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
- 78) [100203] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
- 79) [100204] Re: Mobile phones may foil stealth bombers
by "Benjamin F. Poinsett" <benmail@erols.com>
- 80) [100205] Help!
by "John Moriarity" <k6qq@hdo.net>
- 81) [100206] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 82) [100207] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 83) [100208] Re: Any contests this weekend?
by "Al Gritzmacher " <ae2t@arrl.net>
- 84) [100209] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by "William Mabry" <n4qa@hotmail.com>
- 85) [100210] Re: FS K2
by n2go@arrl.net
- 86) [100211] Re: card from Abubaker , 5A1A
by Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
- 87) [100212] Teflon wire bulk sale
by n2go@arrl.net
- 88) [100213] Teflon wire assortments
by n2go@arrl.net
- 89) [100214] Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
by K4IA@aol.com
- 90) [100215] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
- 91) [100216] PSK-31 FM Question

- by "Phinizy, William" <wphinizy@filenet.com>
- 92) [100217] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
- 93) [100218] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 94) [100219] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 95) [100220] A&A 20 meter Rig Adventures
by "Burke Jones" <Burke@howardandhelmer.com>
- 96) [100221] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 97) [100222] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
- 98) [100223] "The Original INcentive Licensing"
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
- 99) [100224] Speaking of bands!!
by "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
- 100) [100225] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Pete Burbank <plburbank@kih.net>
- 101) [100226] Re: "The Original INcentive Licensing"
by "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
- 102) [100227] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
by John Harper AE5X <ae5x@qsl.net>
- 103) [100228] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Dave Fouchey <dafouchey@home.com>
- 104) [100229] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 105) [100230] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
by K4IA@aol.com
- 106) [100231] Re: Any contests this weekend?
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 107) [100232] Re: card from Abubaker , 5A1A
by John Harper AE5X <ae5x@qsl.net>
- 108) [100233] Re: A&A 20 meter Rig NON- Adventures: ANTIDOTE
by "ss lyon" <sslyon@megalink.net>
- 109) [100234] Going Camping
by "Steven Weber" <kd1jv@moose.ncia.net>
- 110) [100235] (no subject)
by Kt3acam@aol.com
- 111) [100236] Re: Going Camping
by "Bill Jones" <kd7s@psnw.com>
- 112) [100237] Re: "The Original INcentive Licensing"
by Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
- 113) [100238] FS items
by agtaylor@llnl.gov
- 114) [100239] LDG Balun Question
by Ed Lawson <elawson@lawson-philpot.com>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 19:41:30 -0400 (EDT)
From: Doug Faunt N6TQS +1-510-655-8604 <faunt@panix.com>
To: igeq100@iupui.edu
Cc: qrp-l@Lehigh.edu
Subject: [100126] Re: [100041] Operating in VE land
Message-ID: <200106142341.TAA01141@panix2.panix.com>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 01:13:39 -0500 (EST)
From: <igeq100@iupui.edu>
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi, Gang -

I will be taking a vacation trip to the maritime provinces of Canada soon, and would like to do a little QRP operation - maybe even from the site of Marconi's historic demonstration. Can anyone fill me in on the legal and procedural requirements? Like, whom to notify, how to get the rig across the border, how to sign my call, etc. Any help would be appreciated.

73,
Rich, WB9LPU

You must sign with the Canadian prefix, including region number, after the call i.e. WB9LPU/VE3 rather than VE3/WB9LPU, and you should announce your location at least once during each contact.

Other than that, no notification, and as far as I can tell, no customs hassles with the rig.

73, doug

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 19:46:22 -0400
From: <brownh@hartford-hwp.com>
To: tdoooley@atl.mediaone.net
Cc: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100127] Re: Field Day idea / portable suitcase
Message-ID: <200106142346.f5ENkMW15676@hartford-hwp.com>

Thanks, one and all. What a lot of helpful ideas!

Haines KB1GRM

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:58:50 +0000
From: jacksonharbor@att.net
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100128] OT: A Real, Bloody War and Capacitors
Message-ID:
<20010614235851.TYUJ2093.mtiwmhc28.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Speaking of war and capacitors, the CBS evening news had a story on Wednesday concerning the war in the former Congo - here is a web link:

<<http://www.cbsnews.com/now/story/0,1597,296387-412,00.shtml>>

The Col-Tan or Columbium-Tantalite is the raw material from which the element Tantalum is derived. Tantalum is used most prominently in capacitors, especially those in cell phones.

Now I know why those caps are so expensive.

Best Regards,

Chuck Olson, WB9KZY
Jackson Harbor Press
<http://jacksonharbor.home.att.net/>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 17:01:35 -0700
From: Tayloe Dan-P26412 <Dan.Tayloe@motorola.com>
To: "QRPL (E-mail)" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100129] FW: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <87568F78ABDCD211A0AC0008C707718B058C2CB9@az10exm03.sat.mot.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

I would calculate the inductance of 35 cores by calculating the inductance of one turn through one FT37-43 core.

For a FT37-43, Turns = $1000 \times \sqrt{L/420}$; L is in mH

For Turns = 1, L = 0.00042 mH or 0.42 uH.

For 35 cores, the inductance adds, so $35 \times 0.42 = 14.7$ uH

total inductance.

I think you want this to be at least 200 ohms reactance at the desired frequency (4×50 ohms), $X = 2 \times \pi \times F \times L$, so the lowest frequency that 14.7 uH presents 200 ohms reactance is 2.16 MHz.

Dan Tayloe, N7VE; Phoenix, Az; Az ScQRPions

```
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Brian Kassel [mailto:bkassel@dancris.com]
> > Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 8:22 AM
> > To: QRP-L; azqrp
> > Subject: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
> >
> >
> > Gangues and Folks:
> >
> > I just completed a few 1:1 baluns using 35 FT37-43 ferrite beads
> > slipped over a short length of RG-58/U for my FD effort. I wonder:
> >
> > 1.) How can one test this device using non sophisticated test
> > equipment
> > like a calibrated signal generator, attenuators, RF power
> > meter, scope
> > etc.?
> >
> > 2.) I copied this design from a commercial version, but it used rods
> > rather than the toroid type cores. Is the use of 35 FT37-43 toroids
> > enough reactance for say, down to 3,5 MHz.?
> >
> > I don't need very accurate results, just maybe +/- 5 DB or
> > so. Ball park
> > figures basically.
> >
> > There are lot's of sources for the construction of these
> > babies, but not
> > much out there on measuring performance. What I have seen so
> > far, uses
> > HP vector meter etc., beyond what most any ham would have in
> > his shack.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > Brian K7RE
> >
>
```

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 17:02:47 -0700
From: Tayloe Dan-P26412 <Dan.Tayloe@motorola.com>
To: "QRPL (E-mail)" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100130] RE: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <87568F78ABDCD211A0AC0008C707718B058C2CBA@az10exm03.sat.mot.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain

Let me take a quick stab at the 3.5 MHz effectiveness of your balun.

The choke will not affect the internal balanced flow of RF current on the center conductor balanced with the current on the inside of the shield.

For additional currents induced on the outside of the shield (the unbalanced component), the inductance of the choke portion represent added reactance when trying to get to the end point 50 ohm load.

For those currents, the reactance is in series with the 50 ohm termination.

14.7 uh is 323 ohms at 3.5 MHz. This should form a voltage divider with the target 50 ohm termination. $50/(50+323) = 0.134x$ of the induced unbalanced voltage will appear at the 50 ohm termination due to the additional 323 ohm reactance of the choke section.

This is an attenuation factor of $20\log(0.134)$ or 17.5 db of suppression of the unwanted unbalanced signal.

Its a good guess anyway.....

- Dan, N7VE

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Brian Kassel [mailto:bkassel@dancris.com]

> Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 8:22 AM

> To: QRP-L; azqrp

> Subject: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?

>

>

> Gangues and Folks:

>

> I just completed a few 1:1 baluns using 35 FT37-43 ferrite beads
> slipped over a short length of RG-58/U for my FD effort. I wonder:

>

> 1.) How can one test this device using non sophisticated test
> equipment

> like a calibrated signal generator, attenuators, RF power meter, scope

> etc.?
>
> 2.) I copied this design from a commercial version, but it used rods
> rather than the toroid type cores. Is the use of 35 FT37-43 toroids
> enough reactance for say, down to 3,5 MHz.?
>
> I don't need very accurate results, just maybe +/- 5 DB or
> so. Ball park
> figures basically.
>
> There are lot's of sources for the construction of these
> babies, but not
> much out there on measuring performance. What I have seen so
> far, uses
> HP vector meter etc., beyond what most any ham would have in
> his shack.
>
> Thanks,
> Brian K7RE
>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 20:40:33 -0400
From: "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
To: <faunt@panix.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100131] RE: [100041] Operating in VE land
Message-ID: <GAECLOGOMILPLBGKKPEGCEIFCIIA.crmabbott@mediaone.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My experience has been at the border if asked what you are
carrying you can identify yourself as radio amateur. I have
also said ham radio gear when asked, but I don't volunteer.
I always have copy of license with me but have never been
asked. Never had problem about radio gear at border!
I cross at either Windsor or Scarnia, Ontario.

Great experience working rigs in Canada. The repeaters are
a blast also. I have found they will not idly chat about
nothing as found on some repeaters in the states. But my
experience has been excellent for both HF and UHF, VHF.
There is a net around 19:30 Z around 7.04 / 7.055 SSB
and great bunch of guys to listen to.

=====

Chuck Mabbott
AA8VS
42 19' 52" N 83 28' 32" W
Grid Square EN82gh
Home Page: <http://aa8vs.dhs.org/aa8vs>

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]On
Behalf Of
Doug Faunt N6TQS +1-510-655-8604
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 7:41 PM
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: Re: [100041] Operating in VE land

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 01:13:39 -0500 (EST)
From: <igeq100@iupui.edu>
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi, Gang -

I will be taking a vacation trip to the maritime provinces of
Canada soon, and would like to do a little QRP operation -
maybe even from
the site of Marconi's historic demonstration. Can anyone fill
me in on
the legal and procedural requirements? Like, whom to notify,
how to get
the rig across the border, how to sign my call, etc. Any help
would be
appreciated.

73,
Rich, WB9LPU

You must sign with the Canadian prefix, including region number,
after
the call i.e. WB9LPU/VE3 rather than VE3/WB9LPU, and you should
announce your location at least once during each contact.

Other than that, no notification, and as far as I can tell, no
customs
hassles with the rig.

73, doug

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 20:35:36 -0400
From: "Stephen D. Markowitz" <sdmarko@attglobal.net>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100132] Inductance problem
Message-ID: <001401c0f533\$19e5c640\$6c9a6620@oemcomputer>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have a problem with the inductance for a certain filter for 455 kHz.
Namely, it is this: the inductance value is 4372 microhenries. How can you
get two of them wound with only a few hundred turns and a good length.

---KB3FYB

P.S. I have no way of measuring metal permeability.

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 21:01:21 EDT
From: RLemmel@aol.com
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu (Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion)
Subject: [100133] RE: [azqrp] Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <126.a4f7f.285ab861@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hate to keep going back to Maxwell but just happen to be reading his book and
trying to get a handle on this stuff.

According to his diagrams it is only the antenna current in the inner shield
that flows down the outer braid when going from unbalanced to balanced. If
both elements of the dipole where at equal impedance then the currents in
them would be balanced without the balun.

Given a roughly 50 ohm load for a dipole the outer braid impedance as a
result of the choke balun would be in series with only 25 ohms.

Maxwell measured the impedance of 300 no. 73 beads on rg303 coax at 4.0 mhz. The result was $4500 + j3800$ ohms. He also found that the impedance was roughly proportional to the number of beads. On this assumption his advice to use 50 no.73 beads would yield an impedance of abt $750 + j633$ ohms. This, I would assume to be a good reference value as he states this to be adequate for up to 30 mhz.

For abt 9.95 you can get a package of 50 no.73 beads and a length of rg303 from the Wireman (usual disclaimer). You can also get the w2du balun already assembled for a fair amount more.

If your dipole is free from nearby objects which might cause unequal coupling to ground then you balun might produce enough impedance to maintain antennat balance. If your SWR varies greatly with changes in feed lin length then you can proabably be assures you have rf currents on the outer braid.

Good luck with you balun es hope to meet you on the air on FD.

72, Randy wv9n

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 21:07:47 -0400
From: "ZOOM" <kandrparker@sympatico.ca>
To: <sdmarko@attglobal.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100134] Re: Inductance problem
Message-ID: <00cf01c0f537\$97a12260\$3294fea9@robertpa>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

You questions need more meat?
Size/diameter of wire, size of form, what type of material it's wound on.
Is it an air core? ARRL handbook can answer many of these questions. Use calculations as a reference but do not rely that they will be exact. An inductance meter should be used to fine tune the coils.

BTW: what do you mean by metal permeability?
Are you using a metal rod as a core? If so don't! Bad very Bad!

If however you are referring to a ferrite core then experiment if you do not know the core permeability. Formulas are also in the ARRL Handbook.

Cheers,
Robert
VE3RPF

----- Original Message -----

From: "Stephen D. Markowitz" <sdmarko@attglobal.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 8:35 PM
Subject: Inductance problem

>
> I have a problem with the inductance for a certain filter for 455 kHz.
> Namely, it is this: the inductance value is 4372 microhenries. How can
you
> get two of them wound with only a few hundred turns and a good length.
>
> ---KB3FYB
>
> P.S. I have no way of measuring metal permeability.
>
>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 18:12:10 -0700
From: Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100135] Re: qsl cards - authentication
Message-ID: <20010614181210.C8305@oz.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

The more information which is printed on the card itself, the better.
For instance, IOTA awards require that the name of the island be
printed (or at least rubber-stamped) on the card, not handwritten.

In time, we all probably end up with some inadmissible cards. I have a
nice one from Kerguelen (FT5X) which the ARRL didn't accept for DXCC
because my callsign had been corrected slightly by the originator.
Hopefully I'll work another one someday. In any case, when I make an
error in filling out a card, I throw it away and start on another.

72, Bob

--

Bob Nielsen, N7XY
Bainbridge Island, WA
IOTA NA-065, USI WA-028S

nielsen@oz.net
<http://www.oz.net/~nielsen>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 18:18:49 -0700
From: Brian Kassel <bkassel@dancris.com>
To: QRP-L <QRP-L@lehigh.edu>, ad6we@hotmail.com
Subject: [100136] RE: [100022] qsl cards
Message-ID: <3B296279.CAB9BA60@dancris.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Del said:

"Been trying to get some qsl cards designed and read something about cards printed on laser printers or photocopiers not being acceptable because they are too easy to forge. Any comments? Do they need to be commercially printed in order to be "legal?""

Thanks...Del, AD6WE

Del:

I make all my QSL cards on an ink jet type printer, but I always make it a point to sign each one in ink. That way, it is nice and legal. I fill out literally hundreds of cards each year due to my contest work, and have never had anyone object or indicate that they had any problems.

As many of my QSL cards are from operating annually from C6A, which is fairly rare, I would guess that many are submitted for awards, so it would seem that signing each one is worthwhile.

Brian K7RE

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:31:14 +0700
From: "Donny Sirait" <dsirait@centrin.net.id>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100137] QRO op surprised by my QRP SSB signals
Message-ID: <001401c0f53a\$e27c9e60\$d6ee92ca@donnysirait>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear folks,
I think I'll share this with the group.
Few days ago I heard VK6VU calling cq on 20 meters sideband.
he is 59 here in Bekasi (30Km east of Jakarta) and I think I'll
try to give him a call since there were no takers. Normally I
hesitate to make dx calls with sideband but no harm I think.
We did manage a good qso and my 4 watts was 57 there in
Perth. Nev is running 400 W to a 3 el yagi and I'm only 4 watts
to an inverted Vee and he was very surprised to copy my 4 watts.

I don't know whether Nev will consider QRP operation in the future
but I think he from that point will surely respect QRP operations
even on SSB and if he work CW he will be more surprised I guess.

So what I am saying is please do not underestimate your signal
even on SSB give it a try and promote QRP.

vy 72 de YB1B0D
Donny
Bekasi Indonesia

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 21:29:19 -0400
From: John Wagner <john@neknetwork.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100138] FS: TechAmerica Soldering Station
Message-ID: <3B2964EF.29B663D3@neknetwork.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have one of the much-maligned TechAmerica soldering stations for sale.
The unit is about 1 year old and has seen light use. For some reason the
display flickers occasionally. I don't have the manual and at one point
I tried to grind the stock tip to make it more usable. I do not have the
original box either. The unit works fine. I'm selling it because I
recently picked up a Weller WES50 and realize I will never use the other
station again.

It's not a bad iron, I just don't like it. It is very useful for
soldering PL-259's and occasions where a lot of heat is needed over a
large area.

Price is \$35 shipped to your door in the lower 48 via USPS. DX or HI/AK
will be extra shipping. Radioshack.com puts these irons on sale for \$50
on occasion, there is a probably a picture of it there.

73,

John, KB1ENS

--

John Wagner - john@neknetwork.com

Web page: <http://www.neknetwork.com>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 18:41:00 -0700
From: Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100139] Re: Regarding my QSL question
Message-ID: <20010614184100.D8305@oz.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

On Thu, Jun 14, 2001 at 08:20:23PM -0000, Delbert Long wrote:
> I asked the question about laser or inkjet qsls after reading in the July
> 2001 issue of WORLD RADIO (Page 31 - third column)there are NO plans to
> accept laser or ink jet printed QSL cards for ARRL awards. It's too easy to
> forge them. (end of quote.)

As I recall, the statement was that the ARRL would not accept printed versions of eQSLs. A lot of contest and DX stations print out labels with the QSO information using lasers or ink-jets to put on pre-printed cards. This is considered acceptable.

Back in the 1980s I printed my own cards using an HP plotter which had felt-tip pens.

73,

Bob, N7XY

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 22:00:52 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100140] Re: qsl cards
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010614215106.009f7320@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 10:34 AM 6/14/2001 -0400, David Porter wrote:

>I hate to prolong this thread, especially because this is a tangential
>point. No one has stated that "homebrew" qsl cards won't be counted, but
>there is some sentiment that commercial cards might be more valid.

Exactly. You guys are making a mountain out of a mole-hill with this thing. I've submitted cards from some of the states of the former USSR. Some of these states were really poor and hams couldn't afford the nice glossy cards we have here. Some of these "cards" were just pieces of paper with all the info written in by hand. The callsign was done with a rubber stamp. I never had one of those refused by ARRL. But it looked primitive enough that someone could easily have imagined that I made it up myself.

Phil

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 22:12:18 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: dk3red@t-online.de
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100141] Re: Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010614220414.00a02110@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 06:05 PM 6/14/2001 +0200, Ingo DK3RED wrote:

>Hello Brian,

>

> > I just completed a few 1:1 baluns using 35 FT37-43 ferrite beads

> > slipped over a short length of RG-58/U for my FD effort. I wonder:

> >

> > 1.) How can one test this device using non sophisticated test

>equipment

> > like a calibrated signal generator, attenuators, RF power meter, scope

> > etc.?

>

>generator/rig -> swr -> coax -> balun -> dummy/resistor(50 ohm for a 1:1

>balun)

>

>The swr will go to 1.0 if the balun is ok.

With this set-up, the swr will probably be 1:1 anyway, with or without a balun, since there is no radiation (as there would be with an antenna) to induce external currents and all that stuff. A better test is to measure the swr on a real antenna/feedline system, and/or measure the change in forward/reflected power with the balun installed and without it. External

current flow on the coax affects the readings of a forward/reflected power meter. If there is a change, it tells you that the balun is "doing something", which implies that it is doing what it was intended to do.

The real method is outlined in Walt Maxwell's book. He shows how he measured the impedance to external current flow, and the test set-up

phil

> > 2.) I copied this design from a commercial version, but it used rods
> > rather than the toroid type cores. Is the use of 35 FT37-43 toroids
> > enough reactance for say, down to 3,5 MHz.?

>

>You can it calculate. But test it. Same construction like up.

>

>72 de Ingo, DK3RED

>

>E-Mail: dk3red@qsl.net - Homepage: www.qsl.net/dk3red

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:22:52 -0400
From: "Phil (VA3UX)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: "kw3u@warwick.net" <kw3u@warwick.net>
Cc: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100142] Reforming electrolytics
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010614225017.009f28d0@vaxxine.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 05:57 PM 6/14/2001 -0400, kw3u@warwick.net wrote:

>I've heard of reforming, perhaps someone can post how , more or less, to
>do this?

Hi Jim,

Reforming refers to the re-establishing the electrochemical dielectric film in an electrolytic capacitor. As you may already know, an electrolytic capacitor is named

The "factory method" requires heating the capacitor in an oven at 85 degrees C (+/- 5 deg) for 4 hours. Remove immediately and apply 110% of the rated working voltage for 30 minutes. The voltage is applied through a series resistor for current limiting. Remove voltage and let the cap sit a room temp for 24 hours with no further voltage applied. Then apply full

rated voltage again and note the leakage current after 5 minutes. The leakage current should be less than the maximum specified leakage current for that cap, and preferably only 25% of the maximum. I've done this and it works. If the leakage current is still high, you can repeat the procedure once more. If this still fails to reduce the leakage current, the cap is scrap. It's also scrap if the cap "vents" at any time during the procedure.

The other method is to use a variable high voltage DC power supply with current monitoring. Apply voltage while watching the leakage current and stop increasing the voltage when the current reaches the max specified current. Leave at that voltage until the leakage current drops to less than half the max specified current, then increase the voltage again and follow the same rule. Max specified leakage current is calculated from the formula supplied in the manufacturers catalog for that series of cap. The formula varies with different series in the product line. This stepwise increasing of applied voltage allows the dielectric film to re-form gradually without risking an irreversible puncture of the film (that might occur if you just wacked the full rated working voltage to it). Some caps will reform in a matter of minutes (ie. the leakage current drops way down below the max spec current); others might take a day or so small gradual voltage increases to get there. Ones that are hopeless are characterized by a high leakage current that will not decrease any further. Those might still be usable but they haven't got much life left.

An old vacuum tube type "capacitor analyzer" provides everything you need to do this. I have a Sprague TO-5 and a Pyramid CRA-2. These are from the 70's and 60's respectively. Both have a variable 0 - 600 VDC power supply and voltage/current monitoring. They do a lot of other things besides this, but that's what I mainly use them for. Despite that age of these things (boat anchor test equipment), they measure capacitance values surprisingly well. Keep your eyes open at flea markets and on eBay for these things. Eico and others made them too.

Let me know if have any more questions - glad to help.

Phil

```
>tnx just getting into BA's
>Jim kw3u
>
>
>"Phil (VA3UX)" wrote:
>
> > At 06:27 PM 6/13/2001 -0500, Stuart Rohre wrote:
> > >Selamat Tengah Hari, Donny! and the group!
> > >
> > >(Good Afternoon)
```

> > >
> > >Electrolytics of the aluminum type are the ones to go bad over time from
> > >drying out of the electrolyte. The rubber end seals will crack or pop
> open,
> > >and small amount of chemical leakage can be seen on that end. or near the
> > >seal vent, which is the small hole in some at the insulator. This is a
> > >white powdery substance.
> >
> > In spite of this, I've just reformed eight 210 MF/450V capacitors from a
> > power supply that is 20 years old. The supply hasn't been plugged in for
> > nearly 10 years. All caps reformed successfully : leakage current was
> > under 200 micro-amps on all eight; max spec leakage current is 1.8 ma. I
> > mention this only to point out that because they're aluminum electrolytics
> > AND they're old, does not automatically mean they're toast.
> >
> > Phil
> >
> > >Exposure to high humidity and heat of the tropics seems to accelerate the
> > >demise of these. Also, if voltage peaks reach the rating of the cap, they
> > >do not last as long as lower voltages being applied. Pressue build up in
> > >electrolytics comes about when the drying happens.
> > >
> > >Epoxy tantalums almost always short and turn brown from overheating when
> > >they fail, but some can fail open, or show no heating discoloration.
> > >
> > >Military grade metal can tantalums usually last indefinitely. They can
> > >short and reheal, if left out of circuit!
> > >
> > >Hope this helps. I would say you could measure ripple voltage
> increase well
> > >before the electrolytic fails, and thus do not have to change out all old
> > >ones, just any with large AC ripple voltage on the DC
> output. (greater than
> > >original).
> > >
> > >GL and Vy 73/72!
> > >Jumpa Lagi (See you later)
> > >
> > >Selamat Jalan!
> > >
> > >Stuart K5KVH, ex 9M2SM

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 03:23:59 -0700
From: Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>

To: QRP-L List <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100143] Re: qsl cards
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010615031530.01f60900@mail.mindspring.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Personally I find the ARRL's view of QSL cards and eQSL a little silly if not down right anal.

This is a hobby for crying out loud and If I were going to counterfeit something for the sake of wall paper, it would be the certificate itself not a QSL card. Why go to the trouble to send all that stuff to the ARRL when you could just make the wall paper?

Flame suit on, let'r rip...

72,

Bill Walker - KD7JZB
<http://www.qsl.net/kd7jzb>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:36:50 -0400
From: Ken Newman <N2CQ@citnet.com>
To: epaqrp-l@lehigh.edu, QRP-L@lehigh.edu, njqrp@njqrp.org, n9avg@amsat.org
Subject: [100144] [CONTEST] QRP Contest Calendar June 16-25
Message-ID: <3.0.6.32.20010614233650.0091f9b0@mail.citnet.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

~~~~~  
QRP CONTEST CALENDAR

June 16/25, 2001  
~~~~~

All Asian DX Contest (CW)

Jun 16 - 0000z to Jun 17 - 2400z

Rules: <http://home.online.no/~janalme/rules/allasia.txt>

"Asian DX stations a bunch"

~~~~~  
West Virginia QSO Party (SSB/CW)

Jun 17 - 1800z to 2400z

Rules: <http://home.online.no/~janalme/htmlrules/qsowv.html>

"Need WVA?"

~~~~~  
SP QRP Contest (CW) ... QRP Contest!

Jun 23 - 1200z to Jun 24 - 1200z

Rules: <http://home.online.no/~janalme/rules/spqrp.txt>

~~~~~  
Marconi Memorial Contest (CW) ... QRP Category

Jun 23 - 1400z to Jun 24 1400z

Rules: <http://www.qsl.net/ik6ptj/marconi.htm>

"Marconi Memorial"

~~~~~  
ARRL Field Day (CW/SSB/RTTY)... QRP Category

Jun 23 - 1800z to Jun 24 - 2100z

Rules: <http://www.arrl.org/contests/announcements/rules-fd.html>

"Everybody will be here"

~~~~~  
QRP ARCI Milliwatt Field Day (ALL)... QRP Contest!

Jun 23 - 1800z to Jun 24 - 2100z

Rules: <http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/mwfd.htm>

"Enter your QRP FD group here"

~~~~~  
Please foreward the contest info you sponsor to N2CQ@ARRL.NET and we will post it and give it more publicity.
Anyone may use this "QRP Contest Calendar" for your website, newsletter, e-mail list or other media as you choose.
(Include a credit to the source of this material of course.)

72 de **** QRP Contest Calendar ****
Ken Newman - N2CQ <http://www.njqrp.org/data/contesting.html>
N2CQ@ARRL.NET <http://www.n3epa.org/Pages/Contest/contest.htm>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:43:37 -0400
From: "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Cc: "W D. Lindsey/K0EVZ" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
Subject: [100145] FOX: Official Notice
Message-ID: <200106142343_MC3-D5E6-91E4@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Fellow QRPers:

As we approach the beginning of the QRP-L Summer 20M Fox Hunt there has been =

considerable traffic and speculation on QRP-L about other, similar events=
,
so please note:

The name "Foxhunt" or "Fox Hunt" in relation to a QRP "fox and hounds" event is reserved for the official QRP-L events. Technically the name is a Service Mark (and intellectual property) belonging to Chuck, K7Q0, who started the whole thing, put a lot of time and effort into its development, and is still actively involved in administration. Chuck appoints the administrators, is himself a member of the committee, and has

indicated his intention to protect the name.

The QRP-L Fox Hunts have become an institution extending well beyond the QRP-L circle, and that is largely due to a lot of behind-the-scenes work by Chuck and the others who have acted as administrators or event managers. Just as the names "Hamvention," "Field Day," and "Sweepstakes" are identified with specific events or activities, there is only one QRP-Fox Hunt. Obviously there is a lot of appeal in this kind of event, but = organizers are asked to use a little imagination and come up with another= name.

The QRP-L Fox Hunt Committee
N1FN, N1TP, K0EVZ, K7QO, VE5RC

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:45:49 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Scott Rosenfeld [N7JI]" <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>
To: Donny Sirait <dsirait@centrin.net.id>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100146] Re: QRO op surprised by my QRP SSB signals
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.30.0106142341260.13605-1000000@w3eax.umd.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Never underestimate, period.

Propagation has far more to do with DX than does power.

6 meters is the same way - if the path is very friendly to bouncing RF, almost ANY amount of power will get through.

I had a mobile 2w CW QSO with a guy in South Africa, and he was beaming long path, for a distance of 14k miles.

Not bad for 2 watts.

Just the other day, I 40m QSOd K5HK in Reno, NV - 450 miles, 2w/Screwdriver on my end and 450mW SMK/zepp on his end,

but yeah, it is nice to hear/see the surprise of a QROer when the realization is made.

Good DX, 72,

Scott N7JI

On Fri, 15 Jun 2001, Donny Sirait wrote:

> Dear folks,
> I think I'll share this with the group.
> Few days ago I heard VK6VU calling cq on 20 meters sideband.
> he is 59 here in Bekasi (30Km east of Jakarta) and I think I'll
> try to give him a call since there were no takers. Normally I
> hesitate to make dx calls with sideband but no harm I think.
> We did manage a good qso and my 4 watts was 57 there in
> Perth. Nev is running 400 W to a 3 el yagi and I'm only 4 watts
> to an inverted Vee and he was very surprised to copy my 4 watts.
>
> I don't know whether Nev will consider QRP operation in the future
> but I think he from that point will surely respect QRP operations
> even on SSB and if he work CW he will be more surprised I guess.
>
> So what I am saying is please do not underestimate your signal
> even on SSB give it a try and promote QRP.
>
> vy 72 de YB1B0D
> Donny
> Bekasi Indonesia
>

--

Scott Rosenfeld ARS N7JI
541-684-9970 Eugene, OR Land o' much rain
If you find me on the air, I'm probably in my car
ham@w3eax.umd.edu <http://w3eax.umd.edu/~ham>

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 22:50:41 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: phil@vaxxine.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100147] Re: Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <3B298611.DE46C683@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For what it may be worth:

I once had a trapped Yagi that behaved in a weird fashion on 15 and 10. It was fed with the Hy-Gain BN-86 balun that was recommended for it.

I investigated the problem by borrowing an expensive HP vector impedance meter and measuring the Zin of the coax across the three bands and then plotting the data on the Smith chart.

The resulting curves were far from what they should have been, which led me to suspect the balun. I replaced it with one made entirely from coax - the so-called "Collins" balun design - and took fresh data.

When the second set of data was plotted, the Smith charts looked textbook perfect.

So, I would agree that the best test for a balun is with the antenna to which it will be connected, aided by Zin measurements and an examination of the Z-data on a Smith chart. Present-day antenna analyzers can provide adequate data for this - a \$30,000 HP meter is NOT required any more! <:}

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:56:57 EDT
From: W2SH@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100148] Re: Wars and Capacitors
Message-ID: <a3.1764b304.285ae189@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yeah, I used to say condensers a lot. Then I got to thinking: a capacitor has capacitance; what does a condenser have? No, please, not condensed milk!

Cheers,

Charles, W2SH

Date: Thu, 14 Jun 2001 23:42:37 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: kd7jzb@mindspring.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100149] Re: qsl cards
Message-ID: <3B29923D.AB3F05E2@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

At the risk of crowding you in the flame suit, Bill, I have long felt that this whole business of requiring a QSL card to "validate" a contact has long lost any usefulness that it might once have had. Speaking of anal . . .

With today's technology, anyone can readily whip up an authentic copy of anyone's QSL. Or, as you point out, of the certificate itself.

I guess I just don't understand the ARRL mindset that on the one hand portrays amateurs as honorable, law-abiding persons, but will not take their word that a contact has been made. Even the FCC no longer requires us to submit a notarized statement that we can still copy and send code at the speed associated with our license class! (For you new guys, yep, that was once required.)

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Bill Walker wrote:

>
> Personally I find the ARRL's view of QSL cards and eQSL a little silly if
> not down right anal.
> This is a hobby for crying out loud and If I were going to counterfeit
> something for the sake of wall paper, it would be the certificate itself
> not a QSL card. Why go to the trouble to send all that stuff to the ARRL
> when you could just make the wall paper?
>
> Flame suit on, let'r rip...

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 05:05:12 +0100

From: "Chuck Adams, K7Q0" <k7qo@earthlink.net>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100150] [MH101] SW30+ RCVR specs from K8IQY
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010615044826.009e3c60@mail.earthlink.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Gang,

I got Jim's measurements on his receiver from him today.
I won't have mine until next week as I'll note below.

Remember, Jim is using his front end BP filter and his
four pole crystal filter and I believe the rest of the
receiver pretty much follows Dave's (NN1G) design for
the detector and audio sections.

So, here are the specs:

MDS	-130 dBm
Opposite Sideband rejection	55 dB
IF rejection	88 dB
Image rejection	93 dB
Noise figure estimate	14.5 dB

So, these are very good numbers for such a small rig.

I spent last night renaming all the jpg files on qslnet
in my directory. Almost 800 pics I've done over the years
and I was losing track of just what was what, so broke down
and redid everything. Work in progress, so there are probably
a broken link or two, but I will catch them in the next few days.
I hope. And if I don't then someone else will. This for the
QRP-L archive CD Version 4.0.

I will have some more pics on Sunday with my receiver
completed. I am using a program that I wrote during the
last week to redo the art work. I don't like to redraw complex
diagrams without a computer to help out and speed things up.

What I have done is left a small area to the right of the
crystal filter for the IF amp. The detector area is just below
it and I have it built. I can then do the specs without an IF
amp and I can build up several IF amps and put them in place
temporarily on a small PC board in the area left blank and test

each for performance, etc. Film at 11 on that one.

I am going to do one with the LT1252 low cost video amplifier from Linear Technology. Remember this is the one that was used in the Iowa QRP-10A transceiver and I have one in a socket to play with.

I have an MC1350 to play with also, but that is an obsolete part and about the only place to find them is from Dan's Small Parts and some surplus places like Tanner Electronics in Dallas, TX. And the LT1252 can be set at different gain levels and it has great bandwidth and less than 0.01% distortion figure to boot. If you are interested, do a net search on LT1252 and download the .pdf spec sheets and some sample circuits. I'll have to do the source of these parts later or some one can post their favorite source.

I finally found today the gel-cell charger circuit someone was asking about and I'll do the charger up in the Manhattan building section also. And I think FAR circuits already has the boards for this one.

I did place an order today with Goldmine Electronics in the Phoenix area (they do not have a drop in shop to visit and only do mail order) for some of their PC board material.

FYI

Chuck Adams, K7QO CP-60
Prescott, AZ k7qo@earthlink.net <http://www.qsl.net/k7qo>

TMPS-2001 Jan 12th -> April 15th, 2001 States = 49 DXCC = 15

States Needed AK DXCC --- K XE VE KH6 V73 HI3 FM5 OH3 C6 ZL1 C08 ZS6 EA8 EA7
PJ ZL2

Moving to Arizona? --- Bring your own water.

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 05:20:02 +0100
From: "Chuck Adams, K7QO" <k7qo@earthlink.net>

To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100151] [MH201] Announcement for September
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010615050520.00a01ec0@mail.earthlink.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Starting in September of this year as a follow on to the MH101 project, we will be doing a more advanced transceiver than the 30 meter SW30+.

So, this is a start up posting for those interested to be thinking about. As I want to do what will stir up the most interest I am open for discussion OFFLINE on your favorite project may be. Here are some to think about:

1. NN1G Mark II transceiver. This is one Dave did in ARCI QQ in Jan 1994 and Jan 1995 issues. My favorite option for this project as you can do it for any band. Mods --- take out the variable cap and use the current VFO. Work out replacements for the IF cans and the MC1350 IF amp. I will work with Dave to see about permissions on this project.
2. W7EL classic transceiver from the older issues of the ARRL Handbooks. This one is one that I've wanted to do but could never bring myself to try for the volume compression that Roy did. He showed it at Dayton several years in a row and it is a marvel to behold. And I didn't want to think about trying to do repair as it was a 3D layout and the part that would break would be the one in the middle. :-)
3. Sierra multiband xcvr from the ARRL HB. A Wayne Burdick design that everyone should know about by now.

The 2N2222/40 from K8IQY has been done completely in QRPP, so I don't think there is much need for me to even think about doing that one online. K8IQY and NA5N did it to perfection and I have nothing to contribute for that project.

The reason for the early opening of the topic is to allow for the decision making process to close and to allow time for parts selection and posting and purchasing by all participants.

FYI

Chuck Adams, K7QO CP-60
Prescott, AZ k7qo@earthlink.net <http://www.qsl.net/k7qo>

TMPS-2001 Jan 12th -> June 12th, 2001 States = 49(AK missing) DXCC = 15

Moving to Arizona? --- Bring your own water.

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 00:43:28 -0500
From: "Jay Bromley" <w5jay@alltel.net>
To: <n1ln@earthlink.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100152] Re: FOX - Pesky Texan Fox Hunt
Message-ID: <01c801c0f55e\$1b84e8c0\$6518150a@alltel.net>

HI Gang,
I was in the mobile watching my son's baseball team play. I turned on the IC-706MIIG and heard all those Pesky Texans calling CQ Fox. So below is my log sheet and it's not in order of FOXes worked. I printed the sheet off of QRP-L and checked off FOXes as I worked them. Now I know why I never heard OJ with his 100 milliwatts, gezz OJ give a QRP mobile guy a break, grin. After Derek's game I took him home and I drove out to our new field day site to see if the lake could help me out on a PTFH clean sweep. It was not to be, but the noise was a little lower than it is the city and the band was very noisy from the all thunder storms. The antenna I used is a Texas Bug Catcher mounted on a trailer hitch behind and in the center of the Tahoe, somewhere around 12 to 13 feet tall. My power was as low as the 706 would go down to, but I sent 5W for my power. Key used was a Kent paddle. Beacon stations heard were: Uncle Zeek, K5ZTY, (what does this guy do to his antenna to have such a strong signal???), N5TW, K5LN, WA50JE, N5ET, N5TU, AF5Z, W5USJ, W5SB, N1LN. Bob, AF5Z I am sorry for working you twice. The second time I was moving and I couldn't look at my notes. I was very excited to hear you so loud and my son Derek got a big kick out of me using the key while driving him home. He was cheering me on to work you, I should have had him check my sheet before I called, still fun for me to work you for the second time!!! It was great fun to do a little mobile QRP CW while chasing up and down the band looking for that great bunch of Pesky Texan ops!!!!

73 de w5jay..

1. N5TW 599 Tom 5W
2. K5NZ 599 Mike 5W
3. WA50JE 559 Danny 5W

4. N5ET 559 Bob 5W
5. W5PF 559 Paul 5W
6. N5TU 559 Earl 5W
7. AF5Z 599 Bob 5W ----- Twice, but it was just as much fun the second time.
8. W5USJ 559 Chuck 5W ---ArkieCon FT-817 winner, grin!!
9. K5LN 559 Bill 5W
10. WF5W 559 Cal 5W
11. K5ZTY 559 Bill 5W
12. W5SB 559 Bill 5W
13. KK5LD 559 Dan 5W
14. KG5U 599 Dale 5W
15. N1LN 559 Bruce 5W

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 07:26:10 -0400
From: Michael Bower <bowerm@ix.netcom.com>
To: qrp-l <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100153] Indiannapolis?
Message-ID: <3B29F0D2.3BD502F7@ix.netcom.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If there any members of the list in Indiannapolis, would you please contact me off list?

TIA

Michael N4NMR

--

73 de N4NMR
Michael Bower
Ashburn, VA (near Washington, D.C.)

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 07:42:05 -0400
From: "Stephen D. Cohen" <scohen@tampabay.rr.com>
To: "QRP-L Mailing List" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>, "Jim Huhta" <aa4md@amsat.org>, "Jim Gerhart" <kd4rml@gte.net>, "Warren Elly" <w1gud@tampabay.rr.com>, "Garry Allen" <k4cyc@hamclub.org>, "Sean Dougherty" <kg4evw@arrl.net>, "Lee Seeley" <w4ckt@arrl.net>, "Brian Wenholz" <af4sr@hamclub.org>,
Subject: [100154] CLUB: WestFLA QRP Meeting this Saturday, 16 June 2001
Message-ID: <NDBBJALMDCJHFFPJMMFKGEINFJAA.scohen@tampabay.rr.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The next meeting of the Western Florida QRP Club (WestFLA) will be held this Saturday, the 16th of June at the Tampa Amateur Radio Club (TARC) clubhouse in Tampa, FLA. The meeting will begin about 10 AM local time (1400 UTC) and will end when everybody has had enough.

The meetings are run on the NorCal structure, or put another way, without structure. Folks just turn up and show off their projects, or put them on the air (The TARC clubhouse has a tri-bander and a GAP Vertical) or lie about the DX that got away or show off pictures of the grand-kids or get help aligning a radio or whatever. Someone will bring donuts and coffee will be provided (somehow). The TARC facility is nice this way, as they have a full kitchen.

For directions to the TARC clubhouse, simply have a look at:

<http://www.qsl.net/westfla>

You will find a link there to the TARC web page and directions to the clubhouse. The web page also has some pictures from our first meeting, if you would like to get a feel for how they run. If you are interested in attending and you are web challenged, just drop us a line at westfla@qsl.net and we will e-mail directions your way.

I will bring a signal generator, counter and oscilloscope, so if you need help aligning a recent project or debugging something, we will have the correct tools. I can probably even be of some help myself, though I suspect that Mike Maiorana will be more helpful in most debugging ventures. Either way, we can provide some help.

This month I will finally provide Mac with his Direct Digital Synthesis kit from my friends in NJ. This kit produces any frequency from about .1 Hz on up to 60MHz with ease. It contains some cuts and jumpers and some surface mount parts, so maybe Mac and I will get started on putting it together. Mac?

In addition, I will continue to help Mac with his NoGA PIG rig. This weekend is also the Florida QSO party, so there should be plenty of contacts to be made on the low bands. Of course, DXing with the club tri-bander and your QRP rig is always a treat.

Now you know what *I'm* going to bring, what are you going to bring? Well, enough blathering, it's time to get this message out to the world. Hope to see you on Saturday.

73,

Steve, NF4X

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:06:03 +0200
From: "Ingo DK3RED" <dk3red@t-online.de>
To: <phil@vaxxine.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100155] Re: Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <003f01c0f593\$90b5b900\$659001d9@ingo>

Hello Phil,

> The real method is outlined in Walt Maxwell's book. He shows how he
> measured the impedance to external current flow, and the test set-up

I have read the email before from Randy (WV9N) about it and I will buy the named book. One never finishes learning. Thanks.

72 de Ingo, DK3RED

E-Mail: dk3red@qsl.net - Homepage: www.qsl.net/dk3red

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:07:56 -0400
From: "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Cc: "W D. Lindsey/K0EVZ" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
Subject: [100156] Summer FOX Hunt
Message-ID: <200106150808_MC3-D5E4-C09F@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Gang:

Very sorry for the delay in posting the Summer FOX Schedule. The untimely
demise of a computer this past weekend did not help [g]. But never mind, I
plan to have it on QRP-L very soon, hopefully by noon tomorrow. FWIW, 19=

applications were received. As all of them were excellent candidates,
selecting has been quite a challenge :-). Thanks to all who applied.

72,
--Doc/K0EVZ

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 07:21:50 -0500
From: "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>
To: <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100157] Re: qsl cards
Message-ID: <00fe01c0f595\$c247ee00\$0a0b4ed8@rules>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 5:23 AM
Subject: Re: qsl cards

Hey Bill,

> Personally I find the ARRL's view of QSL cards and eQSL a little silly if
> not down right anal.

I agree to some extent, but you put yourself in their shoes and have to look at it from their point of view. They really can't validate the a qsl card unless it has a valid postmark and stamp. Also, for those cards that don't have a stamp, I'd imagine that they'd just have to get in touch with the burro for a particular call area and ask the people there that they trust. I think I've figured a way around this, though, and the league would have a hard time arguing the point.

> This is a hobby for crying out loud and If I were going to counterfeit
> something for the sake of wall paper, it would be the certificate itself
> not a QSL card. Why go to the trouble to send all that stuff to the ARRL
> when you could just make the wall paper?

Amen. OTOH, I'd guess this is the reason why they don't like E-Cards. With the software and hardware that most of us have at our disposal these days, faking QSL cards is very doable.

There is a way around this, though, that could make everyone happy. How about if the burros set up a server on the net, and when we wanted to confirm a contact via computer, we'd just send the thing through the buro's server, which then route the message/card to the DX-operator's machine. You'd have headers galore, and the e-mail path would be very hard to dispute. This would be our version out and their version of a postmark. If you used electronic, digital id's, that would make the system even more secure.

The main problem would be costs here, though. I don't know if the league could afford to hire the programmers and network dudes required to set this system up. I guess we could donate some of the equipment and write some code

for them to do all of this, but that technique takes a long time because the people doing this would only be doing it in their spare time. OTOH, this isn't all that difficult, so I can see it taking only a month or two, with the majority time being used to sure that the systems (one in each call area) stayed up and running.

All in all, the league would have a hard time disputing the validity of a system like this. They might do so, however, because maybe they like looking at those professionally-printed cards, or maybe it's just that they enjoy the smell of things :^). [Just teasing, league dudes!]

Randy

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:26:46 -0400
From: "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
To: "'qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100158] Re: Balun - How to test?
Message-ID: <125490A005E3D3118C9C00805FC743CC016B9EEA@KAHLESS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I'd suggest building the power meter in the June 2001 QST
http://www.bright.net/~kanga/kanga/power_meter.htm

It has about 90 dB of dynamic range, enough to measure the insertion loss of the balun between the input and output shield connections.

If you need to know the impedance, you could resonate the inductance with capacitance and determine the Q. This will let you calculate the real and imaginary parts of the impedance.--Zack W1VT

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:10 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <n4elm@home.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100159] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515084810.IAF03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/7/01 11:01 PM, Dave Redfearn at n4elm@home.com wrote:

>Well, while there are no New Novice licenses being issued, not every
>Novice has upgraded so there are Novice operators still on the HF bands.
>Also, the Technicians with CW privileges use the same HF bands/modes as
>Novices.
>Not to mention that all other license classes have CW privileges in
>those band segments as well.

The BEST solution for this is to return the "novice" privileges to the state they were in before incentive licensing: allow novices (or Tech+) to operate CW anywhere CW is allowed on the given bands (80, 40, 15, 10).

A modern interpretation of that would be give novices (or Tech+) the same CW privileges as general: 3.525-3.675, 7.025-7.1, 21.025-21.100, 28.000-28.300.

This would "free up" 3.675-3.725, 7.100-7.150, and 21.100-21.200 to be "refarmed" for other modes.

>So, I'm not sure how the ARRL can justify re-farming these HF band
>segments and displacing the current users.

Have you actually LISTENED to these band segments in the last 3 or so years?

25 years ago, they had lots of activity. Today, very, very little activity. I'm sure the inhabitants would welcome a move to more populous areas of CW activity.

>As a Novice and after upgrading, I have had plenty of QRP QSOs just
>above 7.100 Mhz and 21.100 Mhz in the Novice band segments, 3,686 Khz is
>a popular QRP haunt on the east coast, and there seems to be quite a bit
>of PSK-31 activity around 28.125 Mhz.

28 MHz would not change. (There's PLENTY of room for all modes on 10m!) It's 80, 40 and (to a lesser extent) 15 that could use some refarming.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"

-- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:08 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <aweiss@usd.edu>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100160] Re: multiband dipole ant
Message-ID: <1010515084808.IAC03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/11/01 2:44 AM, Adrian Weiss at aweiss@usd.edu wrote:

>May I ask -- what is the point of the balun? Do you have to use
>RG213 or other coax because of a physical problem in getting
>the ladderline into the house? If not, and you can run the
>ladderline directly to the tuner, forget the balun and RG213. The
>balun will only introduce unnecessary complexity both to the
>setup and to the antenna/feedline system.

I use the balun to coax to simplify running the feedline into the house to the station. Otherwise, open wire or ladderline would present a significant problem coulding to a myriad metal conductors within the building.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:10 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <W2SH@aol.com>, "QRP" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Cc: "Bill Coleman" <aa4lr@arrl.net>
Subject: [100161] Re: Poor Dipole SWR
Message-ID: <1010515084811.IAG03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/11/01 11:57 PM, W2SH@aol.com at W2SH@aol.com wrote:

>RE: Poor Dipole SWR

>
>When expressed in Imperial units, i.e. feet and inches, the resonant length
>of a half-wave dipole IN FREE SPACE is reckoned to be 492 divided by the
>frequency in megaHertz (dare I say megacycles?).

Right. (At least, it is an approximation)

>This figure only holds
>true
>for a dipole whose length is many (say five or more) thousand times more
>than
>the diameter of the wire (typically AWG--American Wire Gauge--10-18).

Actually, the velocity factor for a wire whose length is 5 thousand times its diameter is .97. My source is the ARRL Handbook 2000, the chapter on Antennas & Projects, page 20.2. They represent the velocity factor for a single wire as the factor K. Same difference. There's a graph which gives K for values of length / thickness ratios of 100 (.94) to 2 million (.982)

>The fact that the length of a real-world dipole is calculated by dividing
>468
>by the frequency in megaHertz has absolutely nothing to do with "velocity
>factor", i.e., the speed of electron "travel".

Actually, according to the same ARRL Handbook, page 20.4:

"The actual length of a resonant 1/2 wave antenna will not be exactly equal to the half wavelength in space, but depends on the thickness of the conductor in relation to the wavelength. This relationship is shown in 20.2 [the graph mentioned above].... An additional shortening effect occurs with wire antennas supported by insulators at the ends because of the capacitance added to the system by the insulators (end effect)"

>This
>less-than-perfect-coupling of a wire end to free space and the compensation
>which is therefore required is called "end effect."

So, we're both wrong (or right?).

The first shortening factor is the velocity of the wire, which depends on its length / thickness ratio. This is based on the physics of electron flow -- since electrons have rest mass, you CANNOT move them at the speed of light without infinite energy, even in free space.

Moving electrons through matter slows them down. (For that matter, it slows light down) This is because the electrons take time to interact with the nuclei they encounter. A single electron doesn't flow from one end to another, instead, through a series of displacements, an electron

entering one end of a wire displaces billions of electrons resulting in an electron exiting the wire. The length / thickness ratio affects the process since the displacements may be in a lateral, instead of longitudinal direction. The (relatively) thinner the wire, the less probability of a lateral displacement, so the velocity factor is higher.

If we assume a length / thickness ratio of 5000, a velocity factor of .97, or a 3% shortening applies.

The second shortening factor is due to the end effect. Only 2% shortening can be accounted for by the end effect in the classic $468/f$ equation.

So, there you have it. Most of the shortening is due to velocity factor.

(Gosh, you learn something every day here on QRP-L!)

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:06 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <nf9k@eudoramail.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100162] Re: G5RV Balun Use Question
Message-ID: <1010515084807.IAA03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/7/01 8:09 AM, Joel Kluender, NF9K at nf9k@eudoramail.com wrote:

>However at present I already have a 4:1 balun and a 1:1 balun, not two
>4:1. I could cannibalize the 1:1 and turn it in to a 4:1. But I was
>wondering if anyone on this list has experience with feeding the two
>systems both ways and can give me a performance comparison from
>experience. It seems to me that the added loss is not too significant,
>because the lossy coax length will be very short, < 10 feet, to get to the
>rig. It would be nice to not have to cannibalize the one.

4:1 or 1:1 it shouldn't matter too much. When dealing with non-resistive loads, the 4:1 or 1:1 transformation ratio doesn't apply. Since you are using a tuner anyway, the tuner will match whatever impedance appears.

As for the coax, yes, it will incur more loss than the open wire. Keep it

short. If you run more than 5 watts, you might want to ensure this is a solid dielectric type coax. This is because the complex impedances on the coax may cause a high-voltage point to appear, and foam coax has a lower breakdown voltage.

For QRP, just about any reasonably sized coax should work. I have a 125 foot doublet fed with open wire, and I use a balun outside and 30 feet of coax before the tuner. I use a 2 kW balun and RG-213 coax to minimize losses and prevent voltage breakdown. (I never run more than 100 watts)

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:12 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <zlau@arrl.org>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100163] Re: Suppression of Even Harmonics
Message-ID: <1010515084812.IAI03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/14/01 11:53 AM, Lau, Zack, W1VT at zlau@arrl.org wrote:

>At 7MHz, high line losses reduce the possible attenuation, making LC
>filtering far superior--Zack W1VT

Depends. It's hard to make LC circuits that can handle high power. For example, many multi-radio contest installations use coaxial stubs on their antenna systems to attenuate harmonic energy. The idea is to remove as much harmonic energy as possible to avoid inter-band interference. If you are trying to listen on 20m while simultaneously transitting on 40m with a full gallon, you'd appreciate it.

The worst place to be is on 10m CW at a kW multi/multi station when all the other bands are active -- all the harmonics seem to land on top of where you're trying to operate.

Of course, with QRP, things become easier....

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net

Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
-- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:48:11 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <k8kfj@ntelos.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100164] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515084812.IAH03605@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/7/01 6:08 PM, Garie Halstead at k8kfj@ntelos.net wrote:

>I received the above info today from a mass FISTS Emailing by Nancy
>Kott (WZ8C) of the FISTS CW Club. It goes without saying that the
>FISTS group (of which I am a member) is very interested in retaining
>current CW segments of our bands.

How can we "lose" CW segments of our bands? CW is allowed EVERYWHERE!

>Until now, I was personally unaware of the formation of this Study
>Committee but knew it was probably forthcoming because of the dropping
>of the Novice Class license.

I believe it was mentioned in the ARRLs comments on the NPRM.

>The questions uppermost in my mind would probably be....
> /1/ What will be the Committee's recommendation to the FCC as to
> the refarming of the HF Novice/Tech Plus HF bands?

Because with the lowering of the CW requirement for HF access, it is expected (and apparent) that a larger number of operators on HF are going to be using modes other than CW (not necessarily all on voice, mind), and that dedicated subbands for Novices / Techs are no longer needed.

> /2/ How much weight will the Committee give to the amateur
> community's comments & input prior to formulating their
> recommendation?

I find the statement that they plan a survey to be a good indication they are eager to hear what the rest of the amateur community thinks.

> /3/ What impact (if any) would their recommendation be to
> our current allocated CW spectrum?

Zero. CW will continue to be permitted EVERYWHERE.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 06:10:15 -0700 (PDT)
From: Curt Milton <wb8yyy@yahoo.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100165] Re: qsl cards - authentication
Message-ID: <20010615131015.284.qmail@web9603.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

well we have not put this thread to death yet

maintaining a high degree of integrity to a coveted
award - particularly the higher levels of DXCC
requires some guidelines. also keep in mind that with
"an institution" the rules are made by those "inside"

overall we should be impressed by what they are trying
to do and also need to realize there is no perfect
umpire this side of heaven.

i suspect the real umpires call things consistently
but are less concerned with completely authenticating
the countries we will all work many times.

also, realize they are studying a "log-book of the
world" concept that will in essence verify the QSO's
without need for paper exchange. this will take time
but we can all envision it happening.

don't let any of this stand in the way of enjoyment of
the hobby. we can be glad we can do more than work
every last uninhabitted spot above water on the globe
- although i will admit to trying to do the same when
they are on the air! but with a K2 in progress i have
not been on the air except 6m SSB and 2m FM

curt wb8yyy

--- Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> Personally I find the ARRL's view of QSL cards and
> eQSL a little silly if
> not down right anal.
> This is a hobby for crying out loud and If I were
> going to counterfeit
> something for the sake of wall paper, it would be
> the certificate itself
> not a QSL card. Why go to the trouble to send all
> that stuff to the ARRL
> when you could just make the wall paper?
>
> Flame suit on, let'r rip...
>
> 72,
>
>
> Bill Walker - KD7JZB
> <http://www.qsl.net/kd7jzb>
>

Do You Yahoo!?
Get personalized email addresses from Yahoo! Mail - only \$35
a year! <http://personal.mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:18:57 -0400
From: "ss lyon" <sslyon@megalink.net>
To: <adamvaz@palm.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100166] Re: SSB rigs for camping & demos
Message-ID: <001f01c0f59d\$bc0ccd00\$5d8798ce@megalink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Adam
For SSB I'd strongly recommend the WM-20 by Small Wonder Labs
<http://www.smallwonderlabs.com/> for economy, battery demands, ease of
building and performance. 20m is good in terms of antenna size, where a
standard dipole can be sloped from the top of almost any tree, pole or
structure. It's designed and supported by one of the very best in the
business, too. (just a happy customer)

72 / 73,
"Seab" Lyon - AA1MY
Bethel, ME 04217 USA
FN44nj

Seabury & Sharon Lyon
99 Sparrowhawk Mtn Rd
Bethel, Me, 04217 U.S.A.
207-836-2576

----- Original Message -----

From: "Adam Vazquez" <adamvaz@palm.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2001 2:56 AM
Subject: Re: SSB rigs for camping trips

>
> sgreene@patriot.net wrote on 4/25/01 5:53 pm:
>
> >
> >I am considering buying or
> >building a QRP rig to take on
> >boy scout weekend
> >and summer camping trips
> >(currently plop & drop with
> >the younger scouts,
> >not backpacking).
> >
> >Since I hope to get some of
> >them interested in ham
> >radio, I expect that I
> >am better off with an
> >ssb-capable rig than a CW rig.
> >
> >A K2 is beyond my kit
> >building skills, while the 817
> >looks nice, I don't
> >want to spend that much.
> >
> >So the MFJ SSB rigs
> >(probbaly the 9420, maybe
> >the 9440) look like
> >reasonable choices.
> >
> >- how good are these rigs for
> >general operating?

> >- battery life (I have a small
> >gell cell unit)
> >- MFJ sells a CW board - has
> >anyone thought about
> >modifying them to use
> >these rigs for PSK31?
> >
> >Comments and suggestions
> >welcome.
> >
> >TNX & 73
> >
> >Steve KA1LM
> >
> >-----
> >-----
> >-----
> >Stephan A. Greene
> >sgreene@patriot.net
>
> Hello de Adam Kb2jpd
>
> start with:
>
> K3WWP's QRP Rigs List for comparisons
> <http://www.alltel.net/~johnshan>
>
> The ft-817 is good provided you have extra battery power.
>
> So far my own near-backbreaking station which I do demos on top of Bear
> Mountain in a dragging suitcase (pre-FT-817) consists of:
>
> *17 AH 12v battery(a car battery jumper w/ built-in LED voltmeter)
>
> *SGC SG-2020 (low current on transmit and receive)
>
> *Mizuho 2w 10m SSB/CW HT (wish I had the Tokyo HiPower HT)
>
> *Kenwood TR-751 2M all-mode (power pig but it is a all-mode)
>
> *Ten-Tec 8w 6M<-2M transverter mounted on top of 2M.
>
> * 2m and 440 torpedo GP from Italy.
>
> *a 4 foot Outbacker Stealth+ mounted on the trunk of my car with the
> mobile mount.
>
> * a half-size G5RV-(was invited by the QSY Society up at Bear Mountain.

> Brought my radio, used their 80m dipole and a car jumper on SSB, woke
> up a few operators using 5w down to 3w. Since then, I carry a wire
> antenna.
>
> Happy Hunting
>
> Adam
>
>
>
>
>
>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:45:12 -0400
From: "AI2Q Alex" <ai2q@adelphia.net>
To: <edkess@pa.net>, "'Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100167] Congratulations on your homebrew 40m xceiver!
Message-ID: <000001c0f5a1\$670207e0\$df0cf618@alex>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mucho congrats Ed! Your work, and Web presentation, proves that the art of homebrewing receivers and transceivers is alive and well.

My homebrew 20-M filter-type SSB/CW transceiver doesn't look as nice as yours. It kinda grew like Topsy. But the reports I get are gratifying enough, and I learned a great deal.

However, your rig is an inspiration for me to re-design mine or build another, and build it to look more professional.

Thanks for letting us all in on your progress and results! In a sense, it reminds me of the "old days" of the ARRL mobile manuals and handbooks, all loaded with page after page of details and photos of home constructed rigs of every description.

-- Vy 73, AI2Q, Alex in Kennebunk, Maine QRP-L 687 .-.-.

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of

Ed Kessler
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 12:46 PM
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: Homebrew 40m xceiver finished

For those interested . . .

I've finally finished my homebrew 40 meter transceiver that I started months ago. The receiver is based on W7ZOI's Progressive Receiver and the transmitter is a modified MFJ Cub circuit. The IF is 5.18 MHz and the VFO runs from 1.820-1.895. Power out is 1.5 Watts.

With the help of W7ZOI's computer programs I designed a 500Hz cw filter which works quite well, as well as a double tuned bandpass filter for the transmitter. Both of these circuits can be viewed on my website.

<http://www.qsl.net/aa3sj/HOME.html> (follow the link at the bottom of the page).

This was the first project that I put together on my own, i.e., putting together a few "pet" circuits to make my own rig. It was quite rewarding and special thanks go to Wes, W7ZOI, and Mike, W3TS for helping me along with the project.

73s
Ed AA3SJ

Ed Kessler AA3SJ
950 Woodside Station Road
Millersburg, PA 17061

website: <http://www.qsl.net/aa3sj>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:52:26 -0400
From: "Ken Simpson, W8EK" <W8EK@fdt.net>
To: "QRP List" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100168] Kenwood HF accessory items FS
Message-ID: <01f901c0f5a2\$6a43a8e0\$4291d4d1@toshiba>

Kenwood HF Accessory items FS:

Kenwood SP-430

This is the speaker that matches the TS-430, TS-440, TS-711, TS-811, and many other Kenwood rigs. This one works 100%, and looks the same. There is not a scratch on it that I can find. It looks like it just came out of the box. I have the single page instruction sheet, and think I can dig in the attic and find the original box (it is 94 degrees here, and I don't want to go into the attic until I need to!) for \$75.

Kenwood MC-80 desk microphone

This desk mic has the 8 pin plug, and is made to work with most all of the Kenwood rigs that take the 8 pin plug. It is a very nice "gooseneck" type mic. This particular unit is just like new in its box with the paper work included for \$90.

Kenwood MC-85 desk microphone

This desk mic is similar to the MC-80, but has provisions for 3 separate cables, so that it can be used with 3 different radios. It also has a speech compressor built in. This one is in good shape, but not as good as the MC-80 and SP-430 listed above. It has a couple scratches on it, but is still in great overall condition, with paper work, in its box for \$110.

Kenwood MC-43 S hand microphone

This is the "standard" microphone that came with many of the rigs that take the 8 pin mic connector that this one has on it. It has "up" and "down" switches, as well as the normal PTT switch. This particular MC-43 is very close to new. It is in its plastic bag. I am not sure if the bag was ever opened or not, so if it is not new, it is very close. \$ 45

Prices do not include shipping from Florida.

Thanks.

73,

Ken, W8EK

Ken Simpson

E-mail to W8EK@fdt.net or W8EK@usa.net

Voice Phone (352) 732-8400

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:01:12 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100169] BNC to from binding post
Message-ID: <00ae01c0f5a3\$a61f08e0\$6b01a8c0@INSYDENT>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A while back I posted the stock numbers for BNC binding post adapters from Radio Shack.

Well, I ordered some of them.

My female BNC to banana post came in just fine. I can now use a decent probe on my old 'Cathode Ray Oscilloscope' which has the standard 3/4" binding post input.

But my Male BNC to Binding post (female banana) was backordered. In addition, the 'description' on the backorder form indicated it was for a DIFFERENT unit.

I called RS and it turns out the print Catalog is WRONG! The online catalog is allegedly correct. It APPEARS that the catalog (the 2001 with the 'eye' on the cover) has the stock numbers for the 4804 and 4806 adapters reversed...

I should know in a few days when the correct unit comes in and I'll let people here know for sure.

Mike

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:03:14 -0400
From: "AI2Q Alex" <ai2q@adelphia.net>
To: <phil@vaxxine.com>, "'Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100170] RE: Reforming electrolytics
Message-ID: <000101c0f5a3\$ebf43b60\$df0cf618@alex>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello Jim and Stuart:

...and Selamat Jalan!

Last winter I built up a power supply for a pair of 813s (I know, not QRP) and discovered that the electrolytic filter caps that I had purchased at a hamfest were not acting as caps at all. They were looking like shorts to the rectifier output when I fired the whole thing up initially.

My power supply includes lots of metering and a Variac in the B+ portion's primary. The first thing I saw was that as I turned up the Variac, the input current soared. Whoa!

I backed off to perhaps five or ten volts ac (not 120 V ac) which set the DC output voltage to maybe 200 or 300 V or so. I left it like that for a few days, and sure enough, the AC input line-current dropped and the caps seemed nice and cool. I then cranked up the DC voltage a few hundred more volts or so, and did that on successive occasions over a period of two weeks.

The filter bank is now fully operational at 3,000 volts, and the primary current is quite low, indicating very low leakage. So, it can be done. In my case, the capacitors are reformed. How ell is only a guess, but the power supply seems to work nicely, with reasonable regulation and low ripple. It delivers up to 500 mA without protest.

Whether or not your results will be successful probably depends on the quality of the caps, their age, etc. But, it's worth a try--at whatever power level, or voltage level, be it QRO or QRP.

Vy 73, AI2Q, Alex in Kennebunk, Maine QRP-L 687 .-.-.

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of Phil (VA3UX)
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 11:23 PM
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: Reforming electrolytics

At 05:57 PM 6/14/2001 -0400, kw3u@warwick.net wrote:
>I've heard of reforming, perhaps someone can post how , more or less, to

>do this?

Hi Jim,

Reforming refers to the re-establishing the electrochemical dielectric film in an electrolytic capacitor. As you may already know, an electrolytic capacitor is named....

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:07:37 -0400
From: "Mark J. Dulcey" <mark@buttery.org>
To: k7qo@earthlink.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100171] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
Message-ID: <3B2A16A9.6080809@buttery.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Chuck Adams, K7QO wrote:

>
> Starting in September of this year as a follow on to the
> MH101 project, we will be doing a more advanced transceiver
> than the 30 meter SW30+.
>
> 1. NN1G Mark II transceiver. This is one Dave did in ARCI QQ in
> Jan 1994 and Jan 1995 issues. My favorite option for this
> project as you can do it for any band. Mods --- take out
> the variable cap and use the current VFO. Work out replacements
> for the IF cans and the MC1350 IF amp. I will work with Dave
> to see about permissions on this project.

It's not clear that you need to replace the MC1350. Although Motorola has stopped making them, Lansdale Semiconductor (<http://www.lansdale.com>) is now authorized to make them. Besides there are still plenty of NOS Motorola parts available.

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:08:40 EDT
From: WA6GER@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100172] SMK & TOROID KIT SHIPPING

Message-ID: <f3.b975146.285b70e8@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I just got home from HamCom yesterday. I apologize for the delay in shipping. However, this trip was prearranged before we knew that we could do this final-final run of kits, so off I went regardless. (hi)

I plan to begin mailing on Monday, and hopefully finish Tuesday. I will go to the post office this morning to fetch the mail, and then begin the process.

I regret this inconvenience caused you by this delay.

jim, WA6GER

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:13:36 -0400
From: Kenneth Hoglund <hoglund@wfu.edu>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100173] [OP] Alternative Power Event
Message-ID: <3B2A1810.E6C369A2@wfu.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Gotten a few nibbles off-list but doesn't seem like there's a lot of interest in trying to organize much for the "Blackout" night. I'll be on the night of the 21st (actually early 22nd UTC) from 3:00-5:00 around the usual 40m qrp meeting area (7.040), batteries fully charged. Hope a few of us can garner some qso's "off-grid."

Thinking about this has given me some slightly crazy ideas for a more organized effort. If a few of you out there with interests in alternative/renewable power sources would be interested in being co-conspirators, maybe we can cook up a fun event for the future.

73

Ken KG4FGC

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 07:25:10 -0700
From: Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
To: myetsko@insydesw.com, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [100174] Re: BNC to from binding post
Message-ID: <005b01c0f5a6\$fc39da40\$650dfea9@nvhbell.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<<<But my Male BNC to Binding post (female banana) was backordered.
In addition, the 'description' on the backorder form indicated it was
for a DIFFERENT unit.>>>

Jameco (www.jameco.com) is an good source for adapters like these as
well as many other experimenter type electronic components. They have a
much wider selection than RS and better prices. Their inexpensive
BNC/Banana adapters are about half the price of Radio Shack's and they
carry the more expensive Pamona line as well.

Lou W7DZN

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:36:53 -0500
From: "Randall Jouett" <rules@bellsouth.net>
To: <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100175] Re: Reforming electrolytics
Message-ID: <002601c0f5a8\$db9ec460\$32094ed8@rules>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here's a copy of an e-mail that I sent to Phil
that some might find interesting and a solution
to use if you're in a pinch or out in the field some
where.

----- Original Message -----
From: Phil (VA3UX) <phil@vaxxine.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 10:22 PM
Subject: Reforming electrolytics

Hey Phil,

> At 05:57 PM 6/14/2001 -0400, kw3u@warwick.net wrote:
> >I've heard of reforming, perhaps someone can post how , more or less, to
> >do this?

Here's a trick that a couple of my friends taught me a while back. It's not as scientific and as correct as your methods -- by a long shot! -- but it has worked for me in a pinch when a variable supply or variac was not available.

Whatcha do is place a lightbulb in series with one of the legs of the power cord. I usually start with a 60-watt bulb and let the device run for an hour or so. Then I power the thing down, put in a 40-watt bulb, and power back up for an hour. Then I power off, put in a 25-watt bulb, and let that run for an hour or so.

Like I said, this isn't the most scientific method in world, but it can get the job done where there isn't a good bench or lab around. I've used this technique in the field when powering up an old piece of gear, and it does seem to work; however, your methods sound like the way to go when at home at the bench or when at work with a lab at hand.

Seeya,

Randy

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:55:43 -0700
From: Bill Walker <kd7jzb@mindspring.com>
To: Thomas Kuehl <ac7a@gci-net.com>, QRP-L List <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100176] Re: qsl cards
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010615143501.02044120@mail.mindspring.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Thomas,

Please don't get me wrong, I completely agree with what you say and have said the same thing myself numerous times.

Where I believe that the service ends and the hobby begins is in the area of awards certificates. I know that contesting and special events are a way to promote good operating practice and that we, as amateur radio operators, are in a way ambassadors for our country in such events.

Applying for an award however, in my opinion, is an action purely connected with a hobby.

In most respects I fully support the ARRL, but that does not mean that I have to agree with everything they do or say.

I suppose that I simply must agree with something that another ham said in a direct reply to me.

> I guess I just don't understand the ARRL mindset that on the one hand
> portrays amateurs as honorable, law-abiding persons, but will not take
> their word that a contact has been made. Even the FCC no longer requires us
> to submit a notarized statement that we can still copy and send code at the
> speed associated with our license class! (For you new guys, yep, that was
> once required.)

At 06:25 6/15/01 -0700, you wrote:

>Bill,

>

>Although we mostly utilize the Amateur Radio Service as a hobby, it is indeed
>a service (Part 97). If it were only a hobby, then it is unlikely that we
>would have the privileges we enjoy today.

>

>Best Regards, Thomas - AC7A (Tucson)

72,

Bill Walker - KD7JZB (Tucson)

<http://www.qsl.net/kd7jzb>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:52:05 -0400
From: "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
To: "'qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100177] Bleeding edge 20M FD filter
Message-ID: <125490A005E3D3118C9C00805FC743CC016B9EEC@KAHLESS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I did some modeling to see what can be achieved with a 20 meter LC filter with optimized coils--14 turns #14 wire on 2-inch polystyrene forms, 2.8 inch length, Q=700.

Even with capacitor losses, a 4 pole 100 KHz bandwidth filter should have less than 6 dB of loss between 14.025 and 14.075 MHz, and 20 dB more loss at 14.150 MHz.

At 14.25 MHz the rejection is 43 dB. This should be great reducing interference from a 20M SSB station.

It is a complex project with a lot of machine work and filter tuning required for proper performance--maybe too hard for most hams?

--Zack W1VT

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:11:27 +0000
From: Garie Halstead <k8kfj@ntelos.net>
To: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100178] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B29DF4F.3065F128@ntelos.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On Friday, 15 June 2001, Bill Coleman wrote:

> CW is allowed EVERYWHERE!

True but let's speak realistically here Bill. When was the last time you transmitted CW in the normal phone portion of a band? Be honest now! :-)

> How can we "lose" CW segments of our bands?

Can you say D-I-G-I-T-A-L?? What if the League were to propose to adjust the 40m bandplan to accommodate this so-called rush to the digital modes utilizing the current Novice band there. I'd consider that a loss of a CW segment, wouldn't you? I'm hearing a strong digital signal here at my QTH right now on 7100. If this were to fly, are you going to transmit CW there simply because CW IS ALLOWED EVERYWHERE?

I think not (nor am I).

> Because with the lowering of the CW requirement for HF access, it is
> expected (and apparent) that a larger number of operators on HF are going
> to be using modes other than CW (not necessarily all on voice, mind), and
> that dedicated subbands for Novices / Techs are no longer needed.

BINGO! You just shot your own argument in the foot Bill ("that a larger number of operators on HF are going to be using modes other than CW"). Does it not make sense then that existing Novice allocations could be refarmed to accommodate these new users of modes other than CW that you refer to? Hello?

> Zero. CW will continue to be permitted EVERYWHERE.

However, if you're a considerate and respectful bandplan proponent, you won't use CW that may QRM other modes already in use (simply to prove the point that CW is permitted everywhere). QSL?

Your lack of concern for the refarming of the Novice bands is duly noted Bill. However, as always, I appreciate your input. We can always agree to disagree. HI

72 //Gary *K8KFJ*
West Virginia

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:13:48 -0400
From: "Wilford D. Lindsey" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
To: "T.J. \"SKIP\" Arey N2EI" <tjarey@home.com>
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>, "W D. Lindsey/K0EVZ" <70511.3041@compuserve.com>
Subject: [100179] RE: [Elecraft] QRP Operation Tips?
Message-ID: <200106151114_MC3-D5FE-35C4@compuserve.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Disposition: inline

Skip:

Well I was lucky enough to start out with low power [g]. My elmer in Mas= on
City, IA, helped me build a tiny 1-tube rig which gave 2 watts out on 80
and 40, depending on crystal and tank coil. Used a tiny neon bulb to twe=

ak

the final tuning. My receiver was the vaunted Hallicrafters S-38D. =

Luckily this receiver was broad enough to allow continuous monitoring of large portions of the Novice sections of the bands :-). Anyway, looking back, I realize how perceptive that elmer was. The lessons learned in those months as a Novice are still proving invaluable. =

72,

--Doc/K0EVZ

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:28:11 -0400
From: "Lofstead, Jerry" <Jerry.Lofstead@itb.mckhboc.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100180] RE: BNC to from binding post
Message-ID: <078F21595FA7D411B87B00805FA728E64A484C@atlexc02ntms.h boc.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Hosfelt Electroncis has them and so does MECI (Mendelson Electronics).

Jerry
W3CDE

-----Original Message-----
From: Louis Hlousek [mailto:lh lousek@n vbell.net]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 10:25 AM
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: Re: BNC to from binding post

<<<But my Male BNC to Binding post (female banana) was backordered.
In addition, the 'description' on the backorder form indicated it was
for a DIFFERENT unit.>>>

Jameco (www.jameco.com) is an good source for adapters like these as well as many other experimenter type electronic components. They have a much wider selection than RS and better prices. Their inexpensive BNC/Banana adapters are about half the price of Radio Shack's and they carry the more expensive Pamona line as well.

Lou W7DZN

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:34:50 -0400
From: "Brian" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
To: <mark@buttery.org>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100181] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
Message-ID: <000b01c0f5b0\$b7f5c380\$3d05080a@cincom.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A check with Craig Behrens of ARCI may yield some. He works for Motorola in Alabama.

I will check with him.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mark J. Dulcey" <mark@buttery.org>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 10:07 AM
Subject: Re: [MH201] Announcement for September

> Chuck Adams, K7QO wrote:

>

> >

> > Starting in September of this year as a follow on to the
> > MH101 project, we will be doing a more advanced transceiver
> > than the 30 meter SW30+.

> >

> > 1. NN1G Mark II transceiver. This is one Dave did in ARCI QQ in
> > Jan 1994 and Jan 1995 issues. My favorite option for this
> > project as you can do it for any band. Mods --- take out
> > the variable cap and use the current VF0. Work out replacements
> > for the IF cans and the MC1350 IF amp. I will work with Dave
> > to see about permissions on this project.

>

> It's not clear that you need to replace the MC1350. Although
> Motorola has stopped making them, Lansdale Semiconductor
> (<http://www.lansdale.com>) is now authorized to make them. Besides
> there are still plenty of NOS Motorola parts available.

>

>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:43:43 -0400
From: "Brian" <bmmurray@amexol.net>
To: <k8kfj@ntelos.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100182] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <002901c0f5b1\$f5943040\$3d05080a@cincom.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Garie,

I transmit CW in the Canadian phone band on 40m almost every night. It's the only way I can check in to the Canadian Nets. <heheheh>

Seriously though, I have QSO's on 40m phone using CW several times a month. If you go there and call CQ a few times, someone will answer you usually.

You guys keep talking about other modes...like what? <GRIN>

73 de KB9BVN

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:44:30 -0500
From: Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
To: aa4lr@arrl.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100183] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B2A2D5E.644@companet.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Bill Coleman wrote:

> The BEST solution for this is to return the "novice" privileges to the
> state they were in before incentive licensing: allow novices (or Tech+)
> to operate CW anywhere CW is allowed on the given bands (80, 40, 15,
> 10).

Just a historical note here: From the inception of the Novice license in the early 1950s, Novices were *never* allowed to operate CW outside specifically authorized small segments.

I was a Novice (WN5WGJ) before and after the first "step" of incentive licensing took effect on 22 November 1968. The *only* thing that changed in my allowed operating bands was that telePHONY was no longer allowed on 145 to 147 mcs.

The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and 75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to find to the lack of activity there now.

73,

Mike / KK5F

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 08:53:18 -0700
From: "N7SG K7FD" <k7fd@hotmail.com>
To: bmurrey@amexol.net, qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100184] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <F36nccYTjr8cU6xfPTe0000c37e@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

>From: "Brian" <bmurrey@amexol.net>
>Garie,
>
>I transmit CW in the Canadian phone band on 40m almost every night. It's
>the only way I can check in to the Canadian Nets. <heheheh>

Don't you mean <eheheh> ?

;) John K7FD

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:59:04 -0400
From: "Mark J. Dulcey" <mark@buttery.org>
To: Brian <bmurrey@amexol.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100185] Re: [MH201] Announcement for September
Message-ID: <3B2A30C8.9030903@buttery.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Active Electronics (<http://www.future-active.com>) claims to have the MC1350P (as well as the MC1350D surface-mount version) in stock; they charge \$3.00 in quantity 1-99, and less for larger quantities. The info came from the following search:
<http://www.future-active.com/results.asp?hidPageName=1&ddCountry=US&ddCurrency=USD&txtSearch=MC1350>
(you'll probably have to cut and paste to your browser in two pieces, rather than clicking on that, because of word wrap in the mailer).

The Active Electronics stores (<http://www.activestores.com>) also have them in single-part packages, and they're cheaper there (\$1.79, I think), though you have to go in person to get them.

If people on the list are looking for one or two parts, I can go to Active (they have a store in Cambridge, MA) and get you some (until they run out, anyway). I'd have to charge somewhere around \$2.50-\$3.00 for a single part. If there is interest, I'll quote an exact number once I find out what the package will cost and weigh) to cover the chip and the mailing cost.

The other distributor sites I checked don't list the MC1350 any more.

Brian wrote:

> A check with Craig Behrens of ARCI may yield some. He works for Motorola in
> Alabama.

>

> I will check with him.

>

>

>

>>Chuck Adams, K7QO wrote:

>>

>>

>>>Starting in September of this year as a follow on to the
>>>MH101 project, we will be doing a more advanced transceiver
>>>than the 30 meter SW30+.

>>>

>>>1. NN1G Mark II transceiver. This is one Dave did in ARCI QQ in
>>> Jan 1994 and Jan 1995 issues. My favorite option for this
>>> project as you can do it for any band. Mods --- take out
>>> the variable cap and use the current VFO. Work out replacements
>>> for the IF cans and the MC1350 IF amp. I will work with Dave
>>> to see about permissions on this project.

>>>
>>It's not clear that you need to replace the MC1350. Although
>>Motorola has stopped making them, Lansdale Semiconductor
>>(http://www.lansdale.com) is now authorized to make them. Besides
>>there are still plenty of NOS Motorola parts available.
>>
>>
>>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:57:35 -0400
From: "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
To: <edkess@pa.net>
Cc: <QRP-L@LEHIGH.EDU>
Subject: [100186] Re: Homebrew 40m xceiver finished
Message-ID: <01dd01c0f5b3\$e69d6640\$72d9b23f@cdcvh01>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----
From: "Ed Kessler" <edkess@pa.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 12:46 PM
Subject: Homebrew 40m xceiver finished

> For those interested . . .
>
> I've finally finished my homebrew 40 meter transceiver that I started
> months ago. The receiver is based on W7ZOI's Progressive Receiver and the
> transmitter is a modified MFJ Cub circuit. The IF is 5.18 MHz and the VFO
> runs from 1.820-1.895. Power out is 1.5 Watts

-----snip-----

Howdy Ed:

Congrats on finishing your new homebrew transceiver. Your mechanical
workmanship is to be envied.

I built the Progressive Receiver several years ago and ultimately converted
to a transceiver just as you have done. I used a different approach for the

transmit section as I just plagiarized the "Ugly Weekender" and cobbled it into the overall circuit.

The receiver is as good on 20M as any I have used including my OMNI VI and holds up very well under contest situations. The transmitter is very stable and puts out a beautiful signal.

Again, congrats on your accomplishment...hope to work you homebrew to homebrew on 20M some time.

Joe W2KJ (North Carolina)

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:01:48 -0400
From: "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
To: <QRP-L@LEHIGH.EDU>
Subject: [100187] Pleasant Surprises
Message-ID: <020b01c0f5b4\$7cfabf20\$72d9b23f@cdcvh01>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howdy gang:

Every so often in Amateur Radio you run into some pleasant surprises.

For instance, I had just finished building up my new Ten Tec 1208 20M to 6M transverter about 4 hours before the VHF contest last weekend and was ready to attach it to a 6M antenna I had built per a Feb 1997 QST article. The article is titled "Wire Gain Antennas for 6 meters" and is described as being an "off center fed longwire".

Anyway, I hook up the antenna and got lucky as 6M had just opened up. I'm hearing very strong signals from W1 land. I recall that I had recently swept my 40M Extended Double Zepp (EDZ) with my MFJ269 antenna analyzer and had found a sweet spot at 50.125Mhz Would the EDZ work on 6M??

I hosed up the EDZ to the transverter and was amazed that almost all signals were better on the EDZ by several S units!!! WOW!! Like I said, what a pleasant surprise!!

I worked a bunch of QSO's mostly from W1 land but also worked the Cayman Islands (ZF1) and all of this with 8 watts output into the EDZ.

The EDZ is fed with ladder line to the shack and then to a 4:1 balun and coax into the shack feeding the transverter without a tuner..

So you sure don't need no stinkin' big beams on 6M (although I would love to have one:-) to make lots of contacts on the "Magic Band".

Hope y'all have a "Pleasant Surprise" or two today in Amateur Radio.

73, Joe W2KJ North Carolina)

I QRP, therefore I am

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:24:22 -0400 (EDT)
From: Frank Brickle <brickle@pobox.com>
To: Brian <bmurrey@amexol.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100188] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <Pine.BSI.4.05L.10106151210090.16040-100000@pluto.njcc.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Fri, 15 Jun 2001, Brian wrote:

> Seriously though, I have QSO's on 40m phone using CW several times a month.
> If you go there and call CQ a few times, someone will answer you usually.

The HFpack freqs are all in phone segments, but, given the relative inefficiency of low-power SSB vs. CW, it's not at all uncommon to find cross-CW/SSB QSOs and roundtables there, especially from DX participants.

In fact the recommended HFpack hailing protocol is *both* CW and voice, on the open freqs and also +/- 5k if clear -- kind of "Manual Link Establishment" :-)

During the VHF contest last weekend there was a lot of mode mixing, too, I thought.

Frank
AB2KT

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:29:50 -0400
From: "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
To: <mmorrow@companet.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100189] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <012601c0f5b8\$711d3120\$6401a8c0@se.mediaone.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and
> 75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to
> find to the lack of activity there now.

I could never understand this aspect of "incentive licensing." Prior to the creation of the novice license class, I believe all licensees were allowed to operate with VF0s or other non-crystal means and at power levels in excess of 75-watts DC input. Was the rationalization that an easier written and code examination meant that the minimum level of competency only allowed for 75-watts and crystal control? If so, where was the data to back this claim?

Also, was the "incentive" simply based on a notion that by crafting an unfounded, unjustified and intentional "crippling" of this amateur class, that the novice licensee would want to upgrade in order to alleviate the frustrations caused by the limitation and achieve the same level of operating convenience he/she would have enjoyed prior to "incentive licensing?" I can certainly understand the concept of "privilege" and upgrade incentives based on other factors such as frequency segmentation. However, the novice restrictions were beyond unreasonable.

I lived and operated during these restrictions in the early '70s. In my opinion, the only incentive achieved through the early novice restriction was an overall reduction in amateur radio interest.

-Paul, W9AC

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 07:52:08 -0400 (EDT)

From: n2go@arrl.net
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100190] FS K2
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.21.0106150750130.7327-100000@valhalla.v>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hello,
Unopened/sealed Elecraft K2 deluxe transceiver kit. I don't have time to
built it or operate it at the present time. \$550.

73,

Jim n2go

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:48:51 +0100
From: "Paul Warman" <pswarman@pswarman.screaming.net>
To: <WA6GER@aol.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100191] RE: SMK & TOROID KIT SHIPPING
Message-ID: <MABBKIIDPNDFPNFIOFJLOEJICEAA.pswarman@pswarman.screaming.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As one of the recipients (and I'm sure this represents a majority view)
forget it Jim, we're grateful for your efforts and recognise that you DO
have a life outside of sorting kits etc. Thanks for your hard work Jim and
the update and good health to you!

Paul
G0odp

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]On Behalf Of
WA6GER@aol.com
Sent: 15 June 2001 15:09
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
Subject: SMK & TOROID KIT SHIPPING

I just got home from HamCom yesterday. I apologize for the delay in
shipping. However, this trip was prearranged before we knew that we could
do
this final-final run of kits, so off I went regardless. (hi)

I plan to begin mailing on Monday, and hopefully finish Tuesday. I will go to the post office this morning to fetch the mail, and then begin the process.

I regret this inconvenience caused you by this delay.

jim, WA6GER

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:47:36 -0700 (PDT)
From: Stan Yarema <bg783@scn.org>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100192] R.E. MC1350P
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.96.1010615094521.5667A-100000@scn>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Jameco still has the MC1350P at .99. It is no longer listed with the linear components, but appears under the Motorola series on page 9.

72..... Stan, K7SY

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 09:56:20 -0700
From: "Bill Jones" <kd7s@psnw.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100193] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <002801c0f5bc\$1b8483e0\$9110010a@fresno>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I started as a novice in the 1950s. At that time the Novice license was good for one year and was not renewable. It was designed to be an entry level license that would enable you to get on the air with simple equipment in a controlled environment. The whole purpose was to help the operator gain sufficient 'hands-on' experience to advance to the General class license.

=====

Bill Jones - <><
Sanger, California

=====

----- Original Message -----

From: "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 9:29 AM
Subject: Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands

> > The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and
> > 75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to
> > find to the lack of activity there now.

>

> I could never understand this aspect of "incentive licensing." Prior to
the

> creation of the novice license class, I believe all licensees were allowed
> to operate with VFOs or other non-crystal means and at power levels in
> excess of 75-watts DC input. Was the rationalization that an easier
written

> and code examination meant that the minimum level of competency only
allowed

> for 75-watts and crystal control? If so, where was the data to back this
> claim?

>

> Also, was the "incentive" simply based on a notion that by crafting an
> unfounded, unjustified and intentional "crippling" of this amateur class,
> that the novice licensee would want to upgrade in order to alleviate the
> frustrations caused by the limitation and achieve the same level of
> operating convenience he/she would have enjoyed prior to "incentive
> licensing?" I can certainly understand the concept of "privilege" and
> upgrade incentives based on other factors such as frequency segmentation.
> However, the novice restrictions were beyond unreasonable.

>

> I lived and operated during these restrictions in the early '70s. In my
> opinion, the only incentive achieved through the early novice restriction
> was an overall reduction in amateur radio interest.

>

> -Paul, W9AC

>

>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:57:56 -0700
From: "Dan Evans" <n9rla@yahoo.com>

To: <brickle@pobox.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100194] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <001b01c0f5cd\$1a498320\$0101a8c0@scottsburg.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> During the VHF contest last weekend there was a lot of mode mixing, too, I
> thought.
>
> Frank
> AB2KT

Cross mode is very common in VHF Contesting, any time there is a difficult path involved. I made several cross mode contacts last weekend. Not having a voice keyer, I often use the CW memory keyer to call CQ, and have more ssb returns than CW:-)

73
Dan

Dan Evans N9RLA
444 Lynhurst St.
Scottsburg, IN 47170
{EM78}
1/2 of the N9RLA /R no budget Rover Team
Check out the Rover Resource Page at:
<http://www.qsl.net/n9rla>
InHam list administrator
QRP-1 #1269

----- Original Message -----
From: "Frank Brickle" <brickle@pobox.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 9:24 AM
Subject: Re: Refarming the Novice bands

Do You Yahoo!?
Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:00:21 -0400
From: "Lau, Zack, W1VT" <zlau@arrl.org>
To: "'qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100195] Re: Suppression of Even Harmonics
Message-ID: <125490A005E3D3118C9C00805FC743CC016B9EEE@KAHLESS>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

I thought hams on this list use inductors and capacitors that are too big to be hurt by the RF out of a Tuna Tin 2.

Zack W1VT

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:20:51 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: paulc@mediaone.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100196] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B2A43F3.1C9E7517@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul,

Having also been there and done that, I believe you are correct in the overall effects of incentive licensing. Incentive licensing came about because it was felt (somewhere) that amateur radio needed an overall technology upgrade! Hams were falling too far behind the curve with the inception of the transistor. Not enough licensees were upgrading. What was missed was the idea of WHY! Sure, upgrade from novice to technician or general just to keep the license, until the novice became renewable! Upgrade from technician to general to get full operating privileges. Upgrade from general to advanced to get what? A piece of paper on the wall!

I can remember wanting to get my general because I would have "full" amateur privileges then and nothing could be taken away from me! Then came incentive licensing. Suddenly I could no longer use that 7,006 kc crystal any longer! I had to get an extra. It took me until the mid 70's to respond to the challenge, but I did and now I hope I won't have to take any more tests for the rest of my life.

I think incentive licensing was one of the League's more stellar failures. It created divisions within the hobby that should not have been there! We are just beginning to recover from the elitist aura that surrounds the extras from the rest of us. Phooey! There ain't nothing special about an extra class license except the guy sweated a little more!

73

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:26:16 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <mmorrow@companet.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100197] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515132617.NAA02120@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 11:44 AM, Mike at mmorrow@companet.net wrote:

>Bill Coleman wrote:

>

>> The BEST solution for this is to return the "novice" privileges to the
>> state they were in before incentive licensing: allow novices (or Tech+)
>> to operate CW anywhere CW is allowed on the given bands (80, 40, 15,
>> 10).

>

>Just a historical note here: From the inception of the Novice license
>in the early 1950s, Novices were **never** allowed to operate CW outside
>specifically authorized small segments.

You're correct. I based this proposal on what I remembered of the great pamphlet "Your Novice Accent" -- a great read for those getting started in CW operating. (It's available on-line at <<http://members.iglou.com/olyellr/novacnt.htm>>) I was sent a copy of this article when I was licensed as a Novice (WN8WOY) in 1975.

>I was a Novice (WN5WGJ) before and after the first "step" of incentive
>licensing took effect on 22 November 1968. The **only** thing that
>changed in my allowed operating bands was that telePHONY was no longer
>allowed on 145 to 147 mcs.

I had thought that the 2 meter priviledges were removed long before then, like back when the Novice became 2 year non-renewable, instead of the 1 year non-renewable.

>The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and
>75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to
>find to the lack of activity there now.

In 1972, the FCC removed the crystal control requirement (partly because they MOVED the 40m novice band, from 7.150-200 to its present location of 7.100-150, to allow for voice mode expansion).

In 1976, the FCC permitted novices to use up to 200 watts PEP. 200 watt PEP power limitations still apply to those operating in the novice band segments (although these limits are often overlooked!)

Back when I was a novice, and on the air (mid 1976- late 1977), the novice bands had a fair degree of activity. On any night on 80m or even the afternoon on 40m, you could find a few dozen stations on the air. Today, you'd be lucky to find a couple.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:33:55 -0400
From: Cameron Bailey <kt3a@juno.com>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Message-ID: <20010615.133357.-4129155.0.kt3a@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:52:10 -0500
From: Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
To: Paul Christensen <paulc@mediaone.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100199] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B2A4B4A.955@companet.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Paul Christensen wrote:

> I could never understand this aspect of "incentive licensing." Prior
> to the creation of the novice license class, I believe all licensees
> were allowed to operate with VFOs or other non-crystal means and at
> power levels in excess of 75-watts DC input.

The limitations on the Novice license were established at its creation in 1951, 17 years before the "incentive" licensing program took effect.

Here's some history.

In 1934, Class A, B, and C licenses were created. All had 13 wpm code tests (replacing the 10 wpm test established in 1922). Class A had an advanced written exam that the Class B did not. Class C was same as Class B, but "conditional" since the exam was not conducted at an FCC office. The CW privileges were the same for all classes, the phone privileges were not.

In 1951, the licensing structure was changed to: Novice, Technician, General (old class B), Conditional (old class C), Advanced (renewed old class A, to be phased out since no new class A exams were to be given after 1952), Amateur Extra (20 wpm code).

This marked the first time that one could get on the air by passing a beginner's slow CW exam of 5 wpm.

The Novice class had very limited operating segments from the beginning, and was good for one year (changed to two years in 1968, and five years in 1978), and could never be re-newed (made re-newable in 1978). The Advanced and Extra had all privileges, and by 1953, the FCC granted General and Conditional all privileges too.

That's where things stood until the first phase of "incentive" licensing took effect on 11-22-1968. New "Advanced Class" exams were once more administered after a 16 year hiatus, and privileges were withdrawn from the General/Conditional Class and to a much lesser extent from the Advanced Class licenses as incentives for these licensees (not the Novice) to upgrade to a higher class.

Thus "incentive" licensing had nothing to do with establishing limits on the Novice license. As I stated, the only privilege I lost on 11-22-1968 was that of telephony on 145 to 147 MHz.

> Was the rationalization that an easier written and code examination
> meant that the minimum level of competency only allowed
> for 75-watts and crystal control?

Exactly, with the added caveat that the Novice license was not

permanent, and was to be used only as a way to get initial on-the-air experience. The 1968 ARRL License Manual says: "...the objective is to give a newcomer a period of actual on-the-air experience so that he may develop his skills toward a permanent class of license more rapidly than he would by textbook study and audio-oscillator code practice."

> Also, was the "incentive" simply based on a notion that by crafting an
> unfounded, unjustified and intentional "crippling" of this amateur
> class, that the novice licensee would want to upgrade in order
> to alleviate the frustrations caused by the limitation and achieve
> the same level of operating convenience he/she would have enjoyed
> prior to "incentive licensing?"

The Novice license was never "crippled" by incentive licensing other than to eliminate limited 2m phone operation. The incentive licensing regulations also doubled the term of the Novice license to two years.

> In my opinion, the only incentive achieved through the early novice
> restriction was an overall reduction in amateur radio interest.

Before the Novice license was created in 1951, to get on the air at all required a 13 wpm code test. The Novice Class was a very helpful and useful step toward actually getting on the air. and building speed to 13 wpm. I thought it was a great help. I suspect many hams licensed after 1951 would never have licensed at all if the lowest class of license available had required them to be proficient at 13 wpm.

I upgraded to Technician (non-conditional) before my one-shot Novice term expired, when I failed my first attempt at 13 wpm before the FCC but was given credit for 5 wpm and allowed to take the General written. The only problem then was that Technicians, even though they had to pass 5 wpm, were not allowed even Novice HF privileges (until the mid-1970s). Fortunately I was active on Navy-Marine Corp Military Affiliated Radio System (MARS) CW nets, and the MARS program allowed *all* operating privileges to Technicians or higher.

73,

Mike / KK5F

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:00:35 -0500
From: Mike <mmorrow@companet.net>
To: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100200] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B2A4D43.6962@companet.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> >I was a Novice (WN5WGJ) before and after the first "step" of incentive
> >licensing took effect on 22 November 1968. The *only* thing that
> >changed in my allowed operating bands was that telePHONY was no longer
> >allowed on 145 to 147 mcs.

Bill Coleman wrote:

> I had thought that the 2 meter priviledges were removed long before
> then, like back when the Novice became 2 year non-renewable,
> instead of the 1 year non-renewable.

Bill,

These changes BOTH took place on 11-22-1968:

- (1) Removal of Novice 2m phone (but not CW) priviledges, and
- (2) Extending the maximum term of the Novice license to two years.

73,

Mike / KK5F

the incentive licensing regulations that took effect in 1968, the date I
spoke of, affected the Novice license

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:24:32 -0400
From: "George Osier" <gosier@twcnny.rr.com>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100201] card from Abubaker , 5A1A
Message-ID: <004101c0f5c8\$6cecdaa0\$25191842@twcnny.rr.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello All !!!!!

Justgot my card from Abubaker , 5A1A from a contact in Feb. Worked him on 10
meters with 700 mw CW (my 88th toward milliwatt DXCC).

Also a nice note enclosed stating that my letter was recieved opened before
it got to him and that he would send me a card via a friend.

Got the card today via Mary Crider , WA3HUP to whom I also give many thanks
!!!!

Good job by Abubaker and Mary !!!!!

My hat is off to both of you !!!!!

73s

George Osier , N2JNZ/QRPP

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:33:25 -0500
From: "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
To: "Phil \ (VA3UX\)" <phil@vaxxine.com>
Cc: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100202] A1 caps
Message-ID: <00a401c0f5c9\$aa046420\$4e100a0a@rohredt2000>

Right Phil!

I did not mean to imply that you should not try reforming ANY electrolytic that shows ripple, just check for shorted ones first, and use lower than normal voltage and gradually increase to bring up old tube set electrolytics. Some will heal well, and some will not, I use a variety of bulbs in series with AC line to radios where I am reforming power supply filters. Starting out with 100 watt bulb, I gradually go to 60 watt, with some hours at each voltage state, and then see if the subject filters are back to near normal filtering.

72 and Thanks for bringing this up,
Stuart K5KVH

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:41:09 -0700
From: Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
To: w6toy@erols.com, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100203] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <00c701c0f5ca\$bec2a4c0\$650dfea9@nvhbell.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<<Phooey! There ain't nothing special about an extra class license except the guy sweated a little

more!>>

Isn't that the main thing that separates anybody from anybody else?
That and a little luck...

Personally, I like incentive licensing because I like being recognized for having sweated and achieved a little more than the next guy. What gripes those who have put in the extra work is now the FCC is awarding the same recognition and privileges to those who haven't.

Will, lower standards and no privilege distinctions among the classes of licenses be good for ham radio? We'll certainly get more participants which will help justify our spectrum allocation and the ham industry and ARRL will benefit from more customers (the dumber the better). I guess, in this case, quantity beats quality.

Lou W7DZN

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:40:36 -0700
From: "Benjamin F. Poinsett" <benmail@erols.com>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu, benmail@erols.com
Subject: [100204] Re: Mobile phones may foil stealth bombers
Message-ID: <3B2A80D4.CAD9ADA5@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

About ten years ago I read an article in one of the technical journals regarding stealth technology and bistatic radar detection. A bistatic radar consists of a transmitter and receiver that are not collocated. The typical or monostatic radar consists of a transmitter and receiver that are collocated. Stealth technology aircraft are difficult to detect using a monostatic radar.

With a bistatic radar the stealth vehicle flies between the transmitter and receiver and the motion is detected. Voila! The target is now detectable.

During the war in the Balkans I suspected that the destruction of the Belgrade TV station and the Chinese Embassy may have had something to do with bistatic radar? A TV transmitter would be an excellent transmitter for bistatic radar. Certainly all the other VHF, UHF, microwave emitters would also be candidates for bistatic radar applications.

Interesting stuff.

72 & 73,

Ben, K3BP

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 11:51:45 -0700
From: "John Moriarity" <k6qq@hdo.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100205] Help!
Message-ID: <009001c0f5cc\$4b6ad540\$f6414cd1@k6qq>

Hi everyone,

I need a copy of the manual for an Oak Hills 40 meter
QRP Explorer. I'm shipping it today to its new owner,
without a manual. I've promised that I'll get him one.

I have the parts list, the schematics, the assembly pictorials
etc, but no assembly, alignment or operating instructions.

I'll be happy to pay all costs.

72,

John, K6QQ
Alturas, CA

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:55:47 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <paulc@mediaone.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100206] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515145547.0AA20512@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 12:29 PM, Paul Christensen at paulc@mediaone.net wrote:

>I could never understand this aspect of "incentive licensing." Prior to the
>creation of the novice license class, I believe all licensees were allowed

>to operate with VFOs or other non-crystal means and at power levels in
>excess of 75-watts DC input.

When the Novice license was instituted, there were three classes of
license:

Technician (which conferred all privileges above 50 MHz)
General / Conditional
Amateur Extra

There was also a number of older "Class A" licensees who were
grandfathered. These later became the "Advanced" class under incentive
licensing. General and Extra had the same access to the bands, although
Extra's were permitted to use modes that would not be permitted a General
(such as Facsimile).

>Was the rationalization that an easier written
>and code examination meant that the minimum level of competency only allowed
>for 75-watts and crystal control? If so, where was the data to back this
>claim?

Back in the early 50's, when the Novice license was instituted, crystal
control was still quite common. Building or setting up a VFO wasn't easy,
and they were prone to drifting, chirps and other keying distortions.
There also weren't very good ways to determining if you were actually in
the subband or not (frequency standards were pretty awful -- at least the
cheap ones).

75 watts was a fair amount of power, given the time period. It was about
as much as you could generate from one WW II surplus transmitting tube.
But novice rigs with a typical output power of 15-50 watts were common.

>Also, was the "incentive" simply based on a notion that by crafting an
>unfounded, unjustified and intentional "crippling" of this amateur class,
>that the novice licensee would want to upgrade in order to alleviate the
>frustrations caused by the limitation and achieve the same level of
>operating convenience he/she would have enjoyed prior to "incentive
>licensing?"

The principle objective of incentive licensing was to encourage people to
upgrade to Amateur Extra.

It failed miserably.

Novice licensees were almost entirely unaffected by incentive licensing.
It was the General / Conditional licensees that lost the most
privileges. Indeed, some harbor ill feelings about this to this day.

> I can certainly understand the concept of "privilege" and
> upgrade incentives based on other factors such as frequency segmentation.
> However, the novice restrictions were beyond unreasonable.

For the time, they made sense. By the early 70s, they didn't. The FCC did get around to changing them, both in 1972 and 1976.

> I lived and operated during these restrictions in the early '70s. In my
> opinion, the only incentive achieved through the early novice restriction
> was an overall reduction in amateur radio interest.

I suppose I hit the curve a bit later. I operated an SB-401 with 1 tube for a while (to keep under 75 watts), then later went to two tubes (about 100 watts -- it was 180 watts DC input). I never had to operate under crystal control.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:05:47 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: <lhrousek@nvtbell.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100207] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <013801c0f5ce\$3287c2c0\$6b01a8c0@INSYDENT>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Personally, I like incentive licensing because I like being recognized
> for having sweated and achieved a little more than the next guy. What
> gripes those who have put in the extra work is now the FCC is awarding
> the same recognition and privileges to those who haven't.
>
> Will, lower standards and no privilege distinctions among the classes
of
> licenses be good for ham radio? We'll certainly get more participants
> which will help justify our spectrum allocation and the ham industry
and
> ARRL will benefit from more customers (the dumber the better). I
guess,

> in this case, quantity beats quality.

>

> Lou W7DZN

I'm sure you know best Lou. Better than all the astronauts for technical ability because they were 'just techs' with one exception for a long time, and weren't 'allowed' to work space based because they were not extra.

Yeah, right. It was really fair!

Just more of the "I did it you should have to also" syndrome.

Mike

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:15:43 -0400
From: "Al Gritzmacher " <ae2t@arrl.net>
To: Gary Slagel <gdslagel@yahoo.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100208] Re: Any contests this weekend?
Message-ID: <3B2A269F.9607.936306F@localhost>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

On 14 Jun 2001, at 7:15, Gary Slagel wrote:

> Any QRP contests this weekend? I took a look at the
> arrl page and saw nothing but thought they might have
> missed something.
>

You can always find out what contests are scheduled for ANY weekend at Bruce Horn's page:
<http://www.hornucopia.com/contestcal/>

You can also sign up for a weekly e-mail reminder of each weekends' contests there.

- Al AE2T

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:21:42 -0400
From: "William Mabry" <n4qa@hotmail.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100209] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <F18xfPTEip68V8zDv60000039d2@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

Mike (and group),

I really enjoyed your history-of-the-Novice-class-license.
Found it to be refreshing (and accurate).
When I was a Novice in 1965/'66 (WN4BJC), felt I had the world by the tail.
Operated mostly 40 CW and never did try 145-147 mc AM...wonder how many actually did...
Never felt restricted at all...the Meissner Signal Shifter, model EX, (and Dad's RME-45 receiver) provided hour upon hour of operating 'magic'. The MSS, EX ran FIVE watts rf output (xtal control...and a good thing:). A little later, Dad (W4MAI) added some 'shoes' for me in the form of an ARC-5 amplifier (75 whole watts, DC input...wow!). When he operated the ARC-5, Dad could run 120 watts DC input!

Going slightly off-topic now...

Wonder how many knew that for many years (before my time:) there was NO PHONE allowed on 40 meters.
Yes, it was a different world then, and it's even 'more different' now :)

I'm sorry to see the Novice license going away...I guess it's time for the powers-that-be to 'experiment' again.

But, overall, I see a healthy amateur radio sporting an exciting new generation of hams as I (quietly?) slip into the OF's Club:)

Oh, and the QRP connection...I still use a MSS, EX (not my original one, sadly) and a MSS, model 9-1090 and they BOTH are QRP rigs! They glow, most wonderfully, in the dark...

73.
Bill, N4QA

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:38:25 -0400 (EDT)
From: n2go@arrl.net
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100210] Re: FS K2
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.21.0106151038130.7618-100000@valhalla.v>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

SOLD

73,

Jim n2go

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:22:53 -0700
From: Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100211] Re: card from Abubaker , 5A1A
Message-ID: <20010615122253.A13838@oz.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Congratulations, George. That is a tough one.

If any of the rest of us (me included) are fortunate enough to work Abubaker, I have seen strong recommendations that cards only be sent to him by certified mail. That should keep the letters from being opened (usually to steal the IRCs/green stamps). Callsigns should not be used on the envelopes either. This is a problem with many DX countries.

72/73, Bob N7XY

On Fri, Jun 15, 2001 at 02:24:32PM -0400, George Osier wrote:
> Hello All !!!!!
>
> Justgot my card from Abubaker , 5A1A from a contact in Feb. Worked him on 10
> meters with 700 mw CW (my 88th toward milliwatt DXCC).
>
> Also a nice note enclosed stating that my letter was recieved opened before
> it got to him and that he would send me a card via a friend.
>
> Got the card today via Mary Crider , WA3HUP to whom I also give many thanks
> !!!!

>
> Good job by Abubaker and Mary !!!!!
>
> My hat is off to both of you !!!!!
>
> 73s
> George Osier , N2JNZ/QRPP

--

Bob Nielsen, N7XY
Bainbridge Island, WA
IOTA NA-065, USI WA-028S

nielsen@oz.net
<http://www.oz.net/~nielsen>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:47:53 -0400 (EDT)
From: n2go@arrl.net
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100212] Teflon wire bulk sale
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.21.0106151038380.7618-1000000@valhalla.v>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Time to pick up quality wire at lowest price.
Five - 1000' rolls of stranded silver plated teflon insulated wire.
It is 22 and 24 AWG gauge.

Here is the deal of the summer, \$100 plus ups and insurance gets you 5000'
of wire. To calculate your shipping cost use my zip code 14227 and allow
23# shipping weight at ups.com First come first served. Do not send money
unless I confirm that I still have some.

73,

Jim n2go

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 10:50:25 -0400 (EDT)
From: n2go@arrl.net
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [100213] Teflon wire assortments
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.21.0106151047580.7618-1000000@valhalla.v>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I have some assortment packs of teflon wire available. It is a box of 10 -fifty foot rolls (500 feet total)
Price is \$24 plus \$4.50 for Priority mail shipping. This wire is 22AWG silver plated/stranded/teflon coated in an assortment of colors for building or antenna construction.

73,

Jim n2go

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:44:15 EDT
From: K4IA@aol.com
To: w6toy@erols.com
Cc: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100214] Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <55.170e3886.285bbf8f@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

You hit my hot button there. I remember well the furor that incentive licensing created. It had nothing to do with transistors. The "League" needed a villan to make it a hero and the villan was CB. After all, CB had stolen our 11 meter band and if we weren't careful 40 meters was next. We had to prove we were better than CB to keep our bandspace. ARRL knew what was good for us whether we liked it or not.

Those who had priviledges yanked were justifiably upset with the ARRL. Wayne Green of 73 Magazine made of lot of hay bashing the League and its supporters. In fact, that is how he got his start. I don't think anyone would have subscribed to 73 if it hadn't been for their disgust with ARRL.

I got out of ham radio in 1970 and the main reason was I lost my beloved CW priviledges and didn't have the time or the knowledge to upgrade to Extra and get them back. Most of my ham buddies dropped out too. Incentive licensing was a huge failure. It cost ham radio a lot of good talent. "Restructuring" which many believe is a dumbing down of amateur radio, is an admission of that failure.

Getting rid of the novice is another huge mistake. The novice I took was a very easy test designed to get someone interested. The limited one year priviledges with 75w input and xtal control meant you couldn't do a whole lot of damage. I remember the novice bands being packed with signals. Of course, the wide bandwidth on those old receivers may have had something to

do with my memeory. hi hi

Novice was ham radio with training wheels. I remember working DX on 80/40/15 meters and phone on 10 meters. It gave you a taste of what was possible and an easy entry to the hobby. Where is that today? If you want to increase interest in amateur radio, you need to attract more operators and the way to get that is to offer an easy-entry, limited license.

K4IA
Buck
Fredericksburg, Virginia USA

Want REAL CHEAP long distance service?
Tune to http://ld.net/?bucksavers

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 12:56:29 -0700
From: Louis Hlousek <lhlousek@nvhbell.net>
To: Mike Yetzko <myetzko@insydesw.com>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100215] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <00fb01c0f5d5\$44facc20\$650dfea9@nvhbell.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Mike,

<<<Just more of the "I did it you should have to also" syndrome.>>>

You jumped to conclusions. I didn't do it. I've only been operating 5 months and I got my Extra in Feb so I'm just a lowly 5wpm Extra.

You kinda lost me with your astronaut train of thought but it seems you would advocate giving astronauts Amateur Extra privileges because they are astronauts rather than having demonstrated radio knowledge and operating skills. Makes as much sense as making all Extras astronauts. I'd be the first to volunteer to go.

Lou W7DZN

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 13:11:42 -0700
From: "Phinizy, William" <wphinizy@filenet.com>

To: "'qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100216] PSK-31 FM Question
Message-ID: <C3AF5E329E21D2119C4C00805F6FF58F04B77112@hq-expo2.filenet.com>

Has anyone tried PSK-31 with FM? I stumbled across a short article in an old QST wherein the author said it was the bees' elbows but gave little in the way of an explanation as to how it was done.

I would be looking to VHF FM PSK-31 (low power, of course) and am pretty clear on the speaker-to-the-soundcard connection. Just wanted to know about the PTT/transmit/etc.

Many thanks in advance..

W. H. Phinizy, K6WHP
Principal Engineer
FileNET Corporation

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:17:55 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: K4IA@aol.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100217] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <3B2A6D73.35D7CD8E@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Buck, what could be easier than the current licensing requirements, short of none at all - AKA CB?

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

K4IA@aol.com wrote:

If you want to increase
> interest in amateur radio, you need to attract more operators and the way to
> get that is to offer an easy-entry, limited license.

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:16:36 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: "Garie Halstead" <k8kfj@ntelos.net>, "Bill Coleman" <aa4lr@arrl.net>
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100218] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515161638.QAA26776@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 11:11 AM, Garie Halstead at k8kfj@ntelos.net wrote:

>On Friday, 15 June 2001, Bill Coleman wrote:

>

>> CW is allowed EVERYWHERE!

>

>True but let's speak realistically here Bill. When was the last time
>you transmitted CW in the normal phone portion of a band? Be honest
>now! :-)

Do you count unmodulated signals for cranking the auto-tuner? <grin>

I don't know that *I* have ever operated CW outside the traditional
segments, but I have heard people doing so.

>> How can we "lose" CW segments of our bands?

>

>Can you say D-I-G-I-T-A-L??

That's different. CW is allowed EVERYWHERE, but other digital modes are
NOT. If FISTS was concerned about the loss of DIGITAL segments, then they
should have said that. But that's not what they said. Instead, there
concerned over the loss of CW segments -- which makes no sense.

>What if the League were to propose to
>adjust the 40m bandplan to accommodate this so-called rush to the
>digital modes utilizing the current Novice band there. I'd consider
>that a loss of a CW segment, wouldn't you?

No, actually not. That might be a good way to accomodate the increased
digital mode operation we see on the bands, in hand with the general
long-term decrease in CW operation.

> I'm hearing a strong digital
>signal here at my QTH right now on 7100. If this were to fly, are you
>going to transmit CW there simply because CW IS ALLOWED EVERYWHERE?
>I think not (nor am I).

Well, I wouldn't, but not because it isn't allowed, but because there is a general prohibition on causing harmful interference.

40m is a special case, because of the mis-alignment between ITU Region I and the rest of the world. (In Region I, 40m is only 7.0-7.1 MHz)

>> Because with the lowering of the CW requirement for HF access, it is
>> expected (and apparent) that a larger number of operators on HF are going
>> to be using modes other than CW (not necessarily all on voice, mind), and
>> that dedicated subbands for Novices / Techs are no longer needed.

>

>BINGO! You just shot your own argument in the foot Bill ("that a
>larger number of operators on HF are going to be using modes other
>than CW"). Does it not make sense then that existing Novice
>allocations could be refarmed to accommodate these new users of modes
>other than CW that you refer to? Hello?

How can I shoot myself in the foot, if you are agreeing with me? We both seem to think that the novice bands ought to be refarmed to other modes.

>> Zero. CW will continue to be permitted EVERYWHERE.

>

>However, if you're a considerate and respectful bandplan proponent,
>you won't use CW that may QRM other modes already in use (simply to
>prove the point that CW is permitted everywhere). QSL?

However, if there's no active use of those other modes in the band segments, there's certainly nothing preventing you from using CW there.

>Your lack of concern for the refarming of the Novice bands is duly
>noted Bill. However, as always, I appreciate your input. We can
>always agree to disagree. HI

I'm not sure we disagree here.

Our HF spectrum is a scarce, precious resource. If we must put up with mode-based band allocations (something that NEARLY ALL other countries DO NOT have), then the segments ought to be parceled out according to projected use and to avoid inter-mode interference.

Given the drop in CW activity since the early 70s, plus the addition of digital modes, as well as the immense increase in telephony activity, reparceling of spectrum makes some sense. It ought to be thoroughly investigated.

Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
-- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:19:00 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <bmurrey@amexol.net>, "QRP" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100219] Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515161901.QAA27010@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 11:43 AM, Brian at bmurrey@amexol.net wrote:

>You guys keep talking about other modes...like what? <GRIN>

RTTY (which to me includes classic RTTY, AMTOR, PSK31, Packet, CLOVER,
etc)
Fax
Slow-scan

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
-- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:18:02 -0500
From: "Burke Jones" <Burke@howardandhelmer.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100220] A&A 20 meter Rig Adventures
Message-ID: <007c01c0f5d8\$481a5440\$2264a8c0@burke>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have an old, but newly constructed, A&A 20 meter cw rig that I am finally getting on the air. I have played with it on the air for about 5 hours now - and have not made a contact yet. I am feeding it into a 1/4 wave 20 meter vertical with 2 radials - some describe it as an inverted 'Y'.

I think the world of QRP is much more difficult than you guys make it sound! I have tried answering numerous CQ calls, but no contacts. I think I need

to work on my "zero beating" the other station. I am not entirely sure how how to do this - it has been about 10 years since I have been active on HF - and electronics and theory have never been my strong suit in amatuer radio.

So do any of you guys have any words of encouragement or advice for a newbie like me?

Burke Jones
N0HYD

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:25:09 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <n4qa@hotmail.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100221] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515162510.QAA27373@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 3:21 PM, William Mabry at n4qa@hotmail.com wrote:

>Wonder how many knew that for many years (before my time:) there was NO
>PHONE allowed on 40 meters.
>Yes, it was a different world then, and it's even 'more different' now :)

Yeah, back then the 40m band was 7-8 MHz. All CW, no waiting....

>I'm sorry to see the Novice license going away...I guess it's time for the
>powers-that-be to 'experiment' again.

The Novice license has been gone for a year. It is sorta late to start mourning.

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:26:43 -0400
From: Bill Coleman <aa4lr@arrl.net>
To: <lhhousek@nvhbell.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [100222] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <1010515162644.QAA27473@gate.iterated.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

On 6/15/01 3:56 PM, Louis Hlousek at lhhousek@nvgbell.net wrote:

>You kinda lost me with your astronaut train of thought but it seems you
>would advocate giving astronauths Amateur Extra privileges because they
>are astronauths rather than having demonstrated radio knowledge and
>operating skills. Makes as much sense as making all Extras
>astronauths. I'd be the first to volunteer to go.

Hey, we'll just make all 20wpm Extras into Astronauts, ok?

<grin>

Bill Coleman, AA4LR, PP-ASEL Mail: aa4lr@arrl.net
Quote: "Not within a thousand years will man ever fly!"
 -- Wilbur Wright, 1901

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:38:06 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: "qrp-1@Lehigh.edu" <qrp-1@Lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100223] "The Original INcentive Licensing"
Message-ID: <3B2A722E.D63AB035@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Reading this thread, I am reminded of when I got into ham radio. Started learning code and theory in 1945 and was licensed in 1946.

In those days, there were essentially two license classes : A and B (with the sub-division of C for those who couldn't be examined at a regular FCC office, etc.)

Class B was where everyone HAD to start. The code was 13 wpm and the exam was reasonable. I managed it as a 16-year old kid and in those days there were the occasional 10-year old hams, but not many. Class B gave you everything *except* phone privileges on 75 and 20; there was no 40 meter phone band. So Class B phone was limited to 10 meters on HF plus the VHF/UHF bands.

To get the Class A you had to operate a year as a Class B and then take a

fairly stiff test on "radiotelephone."

My point: even back then we had two license classes and two classes of operators: the "regular" guys and the "Class A crowd on 75 and 20." Somehow we all got along, and like most of the B-crowd I eventually got interested in phone and got my Class A in 1947. The system was based on incentive licensing: get an A if you wanted to work "real" phone with the "big boys."

By the way, those with the General license who complain about what they lost with the 1968 regs never seem to mention that they were given full access to the 75 and 20 meter phone bands without any additional exam or time in service. Suppose how the Class A boys felt about that in those days?

My Extra came in 1954 while I was taking the Ship Radar endorsement for my First Phone. The Examiner said there was a new ham license class available and asked if I wanted to test for it. I hadn't worked CW in nearly 5 years, so I got permission to listen to the tape for a few minutes before trying. It sounded pretty good, so that took care of the code. The written was, according to the Examiner, made up on all the most-missed questions on all the commercial elements. I confirmed that when several of the questions I had on the Radar exam showed up on the Extra exam! If I had not brought my slide rule in that day, I would never have made it through all the vector/impedance problems on that test! Yes, it took some sweat, and I was and am very proud to hold one of the first ten Extras issued in the Dallas FCC office. Why did I take the exam? Two reasons, it was there and I felt I could do it, and the thought of having access to the precious bottom 25 KHz of each CW band sold me completely!

Well, so much for the past. I do not know where ham radio is going today, but I hate to see so much divisiveness in the ranks over license class, etc. Let's face it, some of us aim higher than others and will always seek to climb that next mountain. Others are happy to just do what they do, and more power to them. But, we have always had different classes of licenses and probably always will have.

Let's all try to hold good thoughts for one another and enjoy our hobby/service.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:40:42 -0400

From: "Charles Mabbott" <crmabbott@mediaone.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>, "Fpqrp Groups" <fpqrp-1@mpna.com>
Subject: [100224] Speaking of bands!!
Message-ID: <GAECLOGOMILPLBGKKPEGOEJECIAA.crmabbott@mediaone.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Has anyone heard lately about the 5MHz proposal and how it is doing? Would seem to be an ideal band for CW or SSB until all the manufactures get the 5MHz in their new rigs that everyone will rush out and buy.

Should be similar to 40 meters so it ought to be a great band. Can some say new QRP monoband rig!

my .02

73 ES oo

=====

Chuck Mabbott

AA8VS

42 19' 52" N 83 28' 32" W

Grid Square EN82gh

Home Page: <http://aa8vs.dhs.org/aa8vs>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 16:45:32 -0400
From: Pete Burbank <plburbank@kih.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100225] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <5.0.2.1.0.20010615163802.00a936b0@KIH.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

>

>The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and
>75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to
>find to the lack of activity there now.

>

>73,

> Mike / KK5F

One fun part was turning the BFO off and copying next to a giant BC station:-)
73 Pete NV4V ex KN0CJF

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:00:13 -0400
From: "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
To: <w5yr@att.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100226] Re: "The Original INcentive Licensing"
Message-ID: <001301c0f5de\$80d71ce0\$6401a8c0@se.mediaone.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> My point: even back then we had two license classes and two classes of
> operators: the "regular" guys and the "Class A crowd on 75 and 20."
Somehow
> we all got along, and like most of the B-crowd I eventually got interested
> in phone and got my Class A in 1947. The system was based on incentive
> licensing: get an A if you wanted to work "real" phone with the "big
boys."

George, thanks for setting the record straight concerning the development of
"incentive" licensing. I kept hearing of "incentive" licensing changes that
occurred much earlier than the date of the incentive change (1968) I
received to my replies today. From what I can discern, two "major"
incentive movements occurred: The first in the early '50s with the departure
from the Class A and B licenses, and the second in the late '60s with
several changes along the way.

Quite honestly, the structure that endured for a long time prior to 1950
with only two license classes is probably just as appropriate today as it
was then. If amateur radio had stayed on a path with only two licenses
classes, I wonder how much more different the hobby would be today?

-Paul, W9AC

>
> By the way, those with the General license who complain about what they
> lost with the 1968 regs never seem to mention that they were given full
> access to the 75 and 20 meter phone bands without any additional exam or
> time in service. Suppose how the Class A boys felt about that in those
> days?
>
> My Extra came in 1954 while I was taking the Ship Radar endorsement for my

> First Phone. The Examiner said there was a new ham license class available
> and asked if I wanted to test for it. I hadn't worked CW in nearly 5
years,
> so I got permission to listen to the tape for a few minutes before trying.
> It sounded pretty good, so that took care of the code. The written was,
> according to the Examiner, made up on all the most-missed questions on all
> the commercial elements. I confirmed that when several of the questions I
> had on the Radar exam showed up on the Extra exam! If I had not brought my
> slide rule in that day, I would never have made it through all the
> vector/impedance problems on that test! Yes, it took some sweat, and I was
> and am very proud to hold one of the first ten Extras issued in the Dallas
> FCC office. Why did I take the exam? Two reasons, it was there and I felt
I
> could do it, and the thought of having access to the precious bottom 25
KHz
> of each CW band sold me completely!
>
> Well, so much for the past. I do not know where ham radio is going today,
> but I hate to see so much divisiveness in the ranks over license class,
> etc. Let's face it, some of us aim higher than others and will always seek
> to climb that next mountain. Others are happy to just do what they do, and
> more power to them. But, we have always had different classes of licenses
> and probably always will have.
>
> Let's all try to hold good thoughts for one another and enjoy our
> hobby/service.
>
> 72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6
> Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
> Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
> Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:05:20 -0400
From: John Harper AE5X <ae5x@qs1.net>
To: QRP-L <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100227] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <000501c0f5de\$e3a414e0\$5b7abc18@johnharp>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

About a year ago, a non-ham friend of mine built a DSW, his first kit ever.
I tested it on the air, got good reports and congratulated my friend on a
job well done. I also invited him along on a QRPTTF trip to show him what us
QRPers were doing with DSWs and other QRP rigs. He really wanted to be a ham

and was excited about the idea of building his own gear and talking around the world using Morse.

I recommended a couple of books, a code practice oscillator and whatever advice I thought would be helpful without being over-bearing. Instead of the books, he took practice exams on qrz.com's web site. One after the other, for months. Instead of a code practice oscillator, he memorized the code by sight, from a printout.

Three weeks ago, he received his Extra. I was amazed at his performance - going from unlicensed to Extra in one sitting! Wow! I called him up to arrange a sked on 40m; I wanted to be his first contact and then rush a QSL out to him. I called him on the agreed-upon freq repeatedly but no answer. After 20 minutes, I called him on the phone. With some hesitation and a lot of shame, he told me that he'd only memorized the answer pool of the written tests and 20 letters in Morse, "but I know all 10 numbers!" he said. He did not know the procedure to initiate or reply to an invitation for a QSO. He didn't know what "de" meant between call signs. He didn't know what QTH, QRM, RST etc mean.

I know and he knows that it is his fault for taking the short-cut approach (ie, lazy) to getting a license. But I am also very disappointed that it is now possible to get a license of any class and know absolutely nothing about getting on the air and communicating. And he has an Extra! He emailed me today the four 1x2 calls he is considering applying for now that he "qualifies". Are we so starved for operators in this hobby that the standards can be trashed? Why have tests at all - why not just hand out call signs. That's essentially what happened to this guy and probably countless others.

After congratulating him, the testing officials ask him if he wanted to put in paperwork to become a VE. What a shame.

John Harper AE5X

Outdoor QRP & Lowband DXing: <http://www.qsl.net/ae5x>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:04:48 -0400
From: Dave Fouchey <dafouchey@home.com>
To: plburbank@kih.net, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100228] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <4.1.20010615170200.009a5100@mail>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

At 04:45 PM 6/15/2001 -0400, Pete Burbank wrote:

>

>>

>>The Novice CW segments were wonderful, but crowded. Crystal control and
>>75 watts final PA input power limits were the requirements. It's sad to
>>find to the lack of activity there now.

>>

>>73,

>> Mike / KK5F

>

>One fun part was turning the BFO off and copying next to a giant BC station:-)

>73 Pete NV4V ex KN0CJF

Isn't THAT the truth! I had ONE crystal, 7.194 MHz....if not for the XTAL
Phasing Filter on the old SX-25 I would have played pure Hades to copy
ANYONE answering me. Still have a rather nice SX-25 even now...

Memories...

73's

Dave

WA4EMR/8 EX WN8AXG/WB8AXG

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:02:49 -0400

From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>

To: lhlousek@nvhbell.net

Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>

Subject: [100229] Re: OT:Re: Refarming the Novice bands

Message-ID: <3B2A77F9.7E749B2A@erols.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Louis,

Sure, it's the thing that separates one of us from the other, also
experience and attitude. I have held my extra class license for over 30
years now. For about the first week I felt special. Then it sank in,
anybody could do it if they just applied themselves. Of course that's
what separates the men from the boys in industry! All in all I don't
think it's worth getting my nose all out of joint because I passed a
test! Where I went to college you were expected to pass them. In
industry your job depended on making the right decisions, just another
form of test.

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:13:38 EDT
From: K4IA@aol.com
To: w5yr@att.net
Cc: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100230] Re: Incentive licensing / Refarming the Novice bands
Message-ID: <bb.fb37b0c.285bd482@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Maybe I am confused, but I didn't think the new entry level (Tech or whatever they call it) included any HF priviledges. Novice let you get your feet wet with more than a "walkie talkie" operation. In fact, you could work the world as a Novice.

K4IA
Buck
Fredericksburg, Virginia USA

Want REAL CHEAP long distance service?
Tune to http://ld.net/?bucksavers

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:08:39 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: ae2t@arrl.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100231] Re: Any contests this weekend?
Message-ID: <3B2A7957.A5E69B4B@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Why do guys always ask this question? I get a weekly list of contests from Ken Newman via this list! Isn't that enough?

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:28:33 -0400
From: John Harper AE5X <ae5x@qsl.net>

To: QRP-L <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100232] Re: card from Abubaker , 5A1A
Message-ID: <000301c0f5e2\$21ea6f80\$5b7abc18@johnharp>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I got a card from him last week. The envelope had been opened but his QSL was still inside. My card to him was sent via registered mail - \$9! Worth it though!

John Harper AE5X
Outdoor QRP & Lowband DXing: <http://www.qsl.net/ae5x>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:31:56 -0400
From: "ss lyon" <sslyon@megalink.net>
To: <Burke@howardandhelmer.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [100233] Re: A&A 20 meter Rig NON- Adventures: ANTIDOTE
Message-ID: <001d01c0f5e2\$9b3db360\$5d8798ce@megalink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well, I'd suggest borrowing a working rig from someone and getting some success under your belt as an antidote. Are you using a tuner & PWR/SWR meter? That can give you some indications that will save you hours of frustration.

There are many things that CAN (and do) go wrong, but believe us when we tell you... this stuff really does work and provide the thrill of "romance" in Ham Radio!

Seabury & Sharon Lyon
99 Sparrowhawk Mtn Rd
Bethel, Me, 04217 U.S.A.
207-836-2576

----- Original Message -----

From: "Burke Jones" <Burke@howardandhelmer.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 4:18 PM
Subject: A&A 20 meter Rig Adventures

> I have an old, but newly constructed, A&A 20 meter cw rig that I am finally
> getting on the air. I have played with it on the air for about 5 hours
> now - and have not made a contact yet. I am feeding it into a 1/4 wave 20
> meter vertical with 2 radials - some describe it as an inverted 'Y'.
>
> I think the world of QRP is much more difficult than you guys make it sound!
> I have tried answering numerous CQ calls, but no contacts. I think I need
> to work on my "zero beating" the other station. I am not entirely sure how
> how to do this - it has been about 10 years since I have been active on HF -
> and electronics and theory have never been my strong suit in amateur radio.
>
> So do any of you guys have any words of encouragement or advice for a newbie
> like me?
>
> Burke Jones
> NØHYD
>
>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:08:51 +0000
From: "Steven Weber" <kd1jv@moose.ncia.net>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100234] Going Camping
Message-ID: <200106152140.f5FLbj22266@wolf.ncia.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Gang,

Man-O-Man, is it as hot where you are as it is here today? Someone please, open the door to Canada and let some cool air down here!

Definatly have to head up into the woods to cool off this weekend. Got my SMT-DSW clone converted to 30M, so will give that a try. Been getting very frustrated with 40 on the weekends, between the contests, the digi stations that like to park on 040 and the VE SSB stations,

I'm hoping 30 will be more productive.

So, got my ultra-light summer pack ready to go, maybe 15 pounds, which includes radio gear, and think I'll head up to a place called "Unknown pond". I scoped it out last fall and looks like a nice field location, especially if I can score a campsite right on the water:-)

72,

Steve, KD1JV in the White Mountains of New Hampshire
"Melt Solder"

<http://www.poniatowski.com/kd1jv/kd1jv.htm>

<http://www.qsl.net/kd1jv/index.html>

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 17:47:21 EDT
From: Kt3acam@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100235] (no subject)
Message-ID: <46.1645744f.285bdc69@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

cam, kt3a

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 14:58:20 -0700
From: "Bill Jones" <kd7s@psnw.com>
To: <kd1jv@moose.ncia.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [100236] Re: Going Camping
Message-ID: <00e101c0f5e6\$4bda3a10\$9110010a@fresno>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

So it's hot there, is it? We're expecting 102 by Sunday. I'm going for a dayhike Saturday up in Kings Canyon National Park. Going just a little over ten miles. It's going to be a little warm-up hike for next weekend where I'm doing four days/three nights in the Sierra. That's a warm up for the BIG hike the end of July.

=====
Bill Jones - <><
Sanger, California

=====

----- Original Message -----

From: "Steven Weber" <kd1jv@moose.ncia.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 10:08 AM
Subject: Going Camping

> Hi Gang,
>
> Man-O-Man, is it as hot where you are as it is here today? Someone
> please, open the door to Canada and let some cool air down here!

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:32:04 -0700
From: Bob Nielsen <nielsen@oz.net>
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100237] Re: "The Original INcentive Licensing"
Message-ID: <20010615153204.B14294@oz.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

On Fri, Jun 15, 2001 at 03:38:06PM -0500, George, W5YR wrote:

>
> By the way, those with the General license who complain about what they
> lost with the 1968 regs never seem to mention that they were given full
> access to the 75 and 20 meter phone bands without any additional exam or
> time in service. Suppose how the Class A boys felt about that in those
> days?

Was that "disincentive licensing"?

As I recall there were a lot of the same complaints as we heard last year. Of course, everyone gained a bit about that time with 40 meter phone and the new 15 meter band being added, so that mitigated the bad feelings to some extent. I hadn't held my license for the mandatory year at the time the change was made, so I was "just" a general and of course I didn't complain. Neither did I have any incentive to get a higher class of license. At the time of incentive licensing in 1968 I wasn't very active so I didn't get around to upgrading until about ten years later.

>
> My Extra came in 1954 while I was taking the Ship Radar endorsement for my

> First Phone. The Examiner said there was a new ham license class available
> and asked if I wanted to test for it. I hadn't worked CW in nearly 5 years,
> so I got permission to listen to the tape for a few minutes before trying.
> It sounded pretty good, so that took care of the code. The written was,
> according to the Examiner, made up on all the most-missed questions on all
> the commercial elements. I confirmed that when several of the questions I
> had on the Radar exam showed up on the Extra exam! If I had not brought my
> slide rule in that day, I would never have made it through all the
> vector/impedance problems on that test! Yes, it took some sweat, and I was
> and am very proud to hold one of the first ten Extras issued in the Dallas
> FCC office. Why did I take the exam? Two reasons, it was there and I felt I
> could do it, and the thought of having access to the precious bottom 25 KHz
> of each CW band sold me completely!

>

> Well, so much for the past. I do not know where ham radio is going today,
> but I hate to see so much divisiveness in the ranks over license class,
> etc. Let's face it, some of us aim higher than others and will always seek
> to climb that next mountain. Others are happy to just do what they do, and
> more power to them. But, we have always had different classes of licenses
> and probably always will have.

>

> Let's all try to hold good thoughts for one another and enjoy our
> hobby/service.

>

You bet! The change was made. Others will probably be made in the
fairly near future. Let's all move on. Besides, CW proficiency is its
own reward.

--

Bob Nielsen, N7XY

nielsen@oz.net

Bainbridge Island, WA

<http://www.oz.net/~nielsen>

IOTA NA-065, USI WA-028S

Date: Fri, 15 Jun 2001 15:40:01 -0700 (PDT)

From: agtaylor@llnl.gov

To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu

Subject: [100238] FS items

Message-ID: <200106152240.PAA04750@poptop.llnl.gov>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/plain; CHARSET=US-ASCII

1) Emtech ZM2 tuner. \$30.

2) Elecraft K1. 40/20m version. with tilt stand. \$330.
available after August 6th.

3) Elecraft K2 with unbuilt ssb and 160/2ndRX modules. \$750.
available after Field Day 2001.

Transceivers are beautiful both electrically and mechanically.
The ZM2 has been used in the field but is electrically sound.

Cash sales only (unless you happen to have an OmniVI+ to trade for
the three items). Domestic ship only, to be paid by purchaser.

Please inquire (until Monday morning!) at the home email address:

taylor541@earthlink.net

Allan G Taylor

agtaylor@llnl.gov

Date: Sat, 16 Jun 2001 00:00:46 -0400
From: Ed Lawson <elawson@lawson-philpot.com>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [100239] LDG Balun Question
Message-ID: <20010616000046.B514@work1>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

After reading all the posts awhile back about baluns having low SWR
across the ham bands and in particular comments about the LDG unit, I
test mine. It was a kit from a couple of years ago. Low and behold the
SWR was all over the place from 3.5 to 35 Mz when a 200 ohm load was put
on the balanced side.

So..I bought the new revised LDG balun. Measured it the same way and
the SWR was around 1.1 from 3.5 to 35 Mz. Big improvement?

I then compared them in use when they are attached to my TT 291 tuner
and then to a 132 Ft. doublet fed with 450 ohm ladder line. Seems the
old balun enables me to tune this antenna for lower measured SWR than
the new one.

So I have the following questions. Since the typical ladderline fed
multiband doublet will have impedances all over the place and the ladder

line is 450 ohm, why should the SWR of the balun at 200 ohm load be anything that really matters?

Is the variations in SWR in these circumstance really important?

Isn't my ability to tune to a better SWR and possibly lower losses in the core of the old unit also important? Curious what the technically astute members of the list have to say in response.

Ed lawson

K1VP

End of QRP-L Digest 2221

